

problems, sometimes infinitely greater than those that confront nations during the periods of great wars. This is a time when the American people should act wisely and patiently, and should not indulge in hysteria or seek for empirical and experimental legislation and fly to every nostrum and every quack that appears in the land. The lessons of the past are replete with information. We can not by legislative fiat change human nature and change the conditions of society that have been set in motion through the operations of the World War. But I believe the American people are going to act prudently and patriotically. I believe that the spirit of unrest will diminish as the days go by; at least I hope so. I believe that we are Americans now as we have been in the past, and that the sinister movements in the land and the intrigues of Bolsheviks and those who seek to destroy the foundation of society will come to naught. There is that stuff in the people of this land that will enable them to meet every emergency and the trials and the dangers encountered will only add to the glory of the victory when peace and justice shall finally prevail.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.
The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, August 20, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, August 18, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O, Lord God our Heavenly Father, the work of the past is done and passed into history. Whatever is good in it shall live, and the evil under the dispensation of Thy providence shall pass away.

But the work of the present and future looms large before us, hence we pray for wisdom to guide us, strength to sustain us, courage to inspire us to go forward with firm and steadfast purpose; that laws shall be enacted which shall tend to quiet the unrest prevalent throughout our country; that the normal may obtain—peace, prosperity, happiness reign. In the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 15, 1919, was read and approved.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. To-day being the third Monday in the month the Calendar for Unanimous Consent is in order. The Clerk will call the first bill.

FEDERAL RESERVE ACT—TO ENCOURAGE FOREIGN TRADE.

The first bill in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2395) amending section 25 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended, approved September 7, 1916.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

VETO MESSAGE—DAYLIGHT-SAVING ACT.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. What has become of the President's veto message on the daylight-saving law?

The SPEAKER. It is on the Speaker's table. It has been thought wise not to take that up until to-morrow, and consequently the Chair thought it better not to lay it before the House at this time, so that the vote might be had upon it to-morrow.

Mr. WINGO. It has already been laid before the House, has it not?

The SPEAKER. It has not. The point of no quorum intervened before the Chair could do so on Friday last.

Mr. WINGO. As I understood the Journal this morning, it contained a recital of the fact that the President's message had been received. I have no objection to the consideration of the message going over until to-morrow, but I think it should be done by action of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is within the discretion of the Chair to lay it before the House when he pleases.

Mr. WINGO. Surely the Chair does not want that announcement to stand—that the Chair has discretion, in the matter of a presidential veto, to lay it before the House when he pleases?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been so advised. To be quite frank about the matter, there is some doubt about a quorum being present to-day, and the Chair thought it better that the message go over until to-morrow.

Mr. WINGO. I have no doubt about that; but the proper thing would be for the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the President's veto go over until to-morrow or until such time as he desires. I have no objection to that; but I do not want the RECORD to show that a President's veto message was received and that we proceeded with other business, without any consideration, as the Constitution requires. I have no objection to its going over, and I suppose the House has no objection. The reasons for its going over are apparent; but the Journal, as read, shows that the message has been received.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman must know that it is not obligatory upon the House to take up the President's message immediately upon its receipt. He knows that as well as anyone else.

Mr. WINGO. It is not obligatory on the House—

Mr. MADDEN. Then, why does the gentleman make so much fuss about it?

Mr. WINGO. I am not making as much fuss as the gentleman. It is not obligatory on the part of the House, except so far as the Constitution places an obligation on the House.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not think we ought to take it up until we get enough Members here from the West to pass it over the President's veto.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose, if the President's veto message is presented to the House to-day, to move a reconsideration of the bill to-morrow. It is my purpose when the message is placed before the House to-morrow to move immediate reconsideration of the daylight-saving bill.

Mr. WINGO. What objection has the gentleman to asking unanimous consent that further consideration go over until to-morrow?

Mr. MADDEN. There is no need for unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Nobody has to make any motion to reconsider. It is an automatic performance.

Mr. MONDELL. There are three distinct motions that can be made relative to the President's message. I simply desire to notify the House that so far as I am concerned the motion to refer it to a committee will not be made, and that it is my present opinion that the daylight-saving bill should be reconsidered to-morrow. Of course, something might occur to render it advisable to delay consideration for a day or two.

Mr. WINGO. I think myself that it ought to be considered at a time when Members are present, but I do not want the Journal to show that the veto message was received from the President and that then the House proceeded in violation of the mandate of the Constitution, which requires consideration by the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not require immediate consideration.

Mr. WINGO. Yes, it does; though the word "immediate" does not appear.

Mr. MADDEN. The House proceeds every day with messages coming from the President, which goes to the Speaker's table, and pays no attention to them.

Mr. WINGO. Not veto messages.

Mr. MADDEN. Any kind of a message. It does not take them up until such time as the House thinks it is proper to consider them, and there is no sense or reason for asking unanimous consent to postpone the consideration of it.

Mr. WINGO. Of course, the gentleman's understanding of the Constitution may be just as unreasonable and senseless and foolish as he thinks the constitutional requirements to consider when the veto is received.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reconsideration of the bill, in view of the President's message, will be taken up to-morrow morning, unless at that time there should be some very urgent reason for postponing its consideration.

Mr. HAUGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. HAUGEN. Can not an arrangement be made to refer it to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and that committee can report it back whenever it is deemed expedient?

Mr. MONDELL. I think it has been understood that the bill will be taken up to-morrow and reconsidered, in view of the veto message.

Mr. HAUGEN. Some of the Members are out of the city, and everybody ought to be given an opportunity to be here.

Mr. MONDELL. Members have all been notified that the House was going to begin to do business and a quorum was necessary here this morning and from now on, and notice has been given on each side of the House to that effect.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not think there is any sense of referring it to the committee.

Mr. WINGO. Nobody wants to refer it to the committee. Everybody knows how they are going to vote on it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, regular order!

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order against the proceeding.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. WINGO. I make the point of order that the veto message from the President of the United States is on the table, and that under the practice and rules of the House and the constitutional provision the House should proceed to consider it. I move to postpone further consideration of that bill until to-morrow.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman can not do that with a point of order pending.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point of order that the gentleman can not make that motion while a point of order is pending.

The SPEAKER. That is correct. The first point of order that the gentleman makes is, as the Chair understands it, that a veto message of the President having been received by the House it must be acted upon before any other business is considered. Is that the point of order?

Mr. WINGO. That is the point of order, and that it is a privileged matter. There is no question about its being a privileged matter. We will get action one way or the other.

The SPEAKER. There is no question in the mind of the Chair that it is a privileged matter.

Mr. WINGO. I have no objection to entering into an agreement to consider it at a future date. My own desire was not to ignore it, in face of the constitutional requirement that we "shall proceed to reconsider it."

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the President's message go over until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the President's message be considered to-morrow. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. WINGO. May go over until to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to that request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WINGO. I withdraw my point of order, as the action of the House just taken by unanimous consent, I think, meets the requirement of section 7, Article I, of the Constitution, which provides that when the President does not approve a bill "he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal and proceed to reconsider." Previous Speakers have ruled that a motion to defer as well as one to refer are "allowable within the constitutional mandate that the House 'shall proceed to reconsider.'"

My only desire is to preserve orderly procedure and duly observe the mandates and plain provisions of the Constitution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

FORWARDING AND RETURN OF MAIL MATTER OF SECOND, THIRD, AND FOURTH CLASSES.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6951) authorizing the return to the sender or the forwarding of undeliverable second, third, and fourth class mail matter.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this bill to return to the sender bulky mail matter, such as catalogues, newspapers, magazines, and so on, whenever not delivered, sending them across the country?

Mr. STEENERSON. There are two kinds of mail matter contemplated in the bill. The first is fourth-class matter of a perishable nature and of obvious value. It may be forwarded to another post office or, if undeliverable, returned to the sender, charged with the forwarding or return postage. This under such rules as the Postmaster General may prescribe. The second provision would cover second, third, and fourth class matter, including catalogues, and authorizes the forwarding or return of such matter, charged with the forwarding or return postage, provided that the sender when he sent it originally placed on it a pledge to pay the forwarding postage or return postage in case it is forwarded or returned.

Mr. ELSTON. This return will not be at the expense of the Government?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will yield.

Mr. MANN. The language of the bill is, "may be forwarded to the addressee at another post office." Does the word "may" mean the word "shall"?

Mr. STEENERSON. In the first clause of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Well, anywhere in the bill. It runs all through the bill, the word "may." Does that mean "shall"?

Mr. STEENERSON. It does not mean shall in the first part of the bill, because that is determined by the Post Office Department, as to whether it is of obvious value. It is a matter they have to determine.

Mr. MANN. That is what I wanted to know. It says that if it is of obvious value it may be forwarded to the addressee at another post office. Does that mean "shall"?

Mr. STEENERSON. Of course, the word "may" is often construed the same as "shall."

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but what I wanted to get at is what is intended in the bill. Does it mean—I suppose this was drawn in the Post Office Department?

Mr. STEENERSON. It was drawn in the Post Office Department, and I think it means simply conferring authority on them to do so. It hardly would require it in case they would feel that it ought to be done.

Mr. MANN. It does not mean, then, that it may be forwarded at the request of the addressee? He will have nothing to say about it?

Mr. STEENERSON. The addressee? The first-described matter does not require any direction whatever. The Post Office Department, under the rules and regulations they prescribe, will forward it, if it is of obvious value and perishable nature, either to another address or return it to the sender. But the matter described in the second clause of the bill must bear the pledge of the sender.

There is at present no provision for forwarding or returning without prepayment of forwarding or return postage any mail matter except letters (R. S., 3940; 3939 as amended; 36 Stat., 630). The word "letters" is construed to include all first-class matter in the case of forwarding, all except postal cards in the case of returning (Postal Laws and Regulations, secs. 595, 633). Undeliverable perishable mail matter is at present turned over to municipal authorities for distribution to hospitals, and so forth (Postal Laws and Regulations, sec. 636).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution No. 167, making the provisions of section 2296 of the United States Revised Statutes applicable to all entries made under the homestead laws and laws supplemental and amendatory thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask that some one in charge of the resolution advise us of the necessity for the passage of the resolution under the present form?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, the present law, section 2296, reads as follows:

No lands acquired under the provisions of this chapter shall in any event become liable to the satisfaction of any debt contracted prior to the issuing of the patent therefor.

That has been the law for the last 50 years in regard to homesteads. It is a question, and some of the courts have held it does not apply to the enlarged homestead. The matter was taken up with the Secretary of the Interior, and he thought that rather than to introduce another resolution we should take the one that the committee had reported. The committee has considered the matter and reported this resolution, and given all homestead claims upon the bills enacted since section 2296 was enacted the same right. We have the 320-acre homestead; we have the 640-acre stock-raising homestead; and so that they might all have the same protection the present resolution is now before the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, this resolution in form seems to be a mere construction of a statute. The provisions of section 2296 of the Revised Statutes have been and are applicable to all entries made under the homestead laws.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MANN. Now, the law does not so provide. Why does not the form of the resolution state that they are hereby made applicable? That is making law.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAKER. I introduced a resolution, as suggested by the gentleman. The department came back twice recommending each time the passage of the resolution that is now submitted, and the committee has adopted this resolution. Therefore I accepted the statement of the Secretary of the Interior in preference to what I thought in regard to the facts.

Mr. MANN. It is a rather bad habit to take the suggestion of some clerk in the Department of the Interior for the form of a bill. The clerks are not very reliable about such things. I suppose the intention is to make this relate back and cover some case that has already been disposed of under the existing law, probably to affect rights already acquired adversely. Of course, you make law by construction, but it is not a very good way in which to make law.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, so that there may be no question of the propriety of passing it in this form, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the resolution will be stricken from the calendar.

The Clerk will report the next business.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain on the calendar and go to the foot of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] asks unanimous consent that the resolution just objected to—

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, if it is to be called up again to-day I shall object.

Mr. RAKER. No, sir; not to-day.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I will not object.

FRATERNAL SANITARIUMS ON PUBLIC LANDS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 1125) to authorize the Secretary having jurisdiction of the same to set aside public lands to be used as national sanitariums by fraternal or benevolent organizations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object for the purpose of learning from the proponents of this bill the necessity, if there be any necessity, for the passage of a bill of this kind at this time; whether or not there are any organizations desirous of using this unoccupied land for sanitarium purposes, and the benefits to be derived therefrom?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been before Congress for the last three years. House bill 16029, Sixty-third Congress, passed the House unanimously. It was reported out favorably by the Senate but failed to pass because of the congestion of business. The necessity for this legislation is that the Masonic fraternity, the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, the Owls, the A. O. U. W., and others are requesting that this legislation be enacted, and that they severally desire to locate homes and places upon the public land where the climate is salubrious and proper, to the end that their members may be cared and provided for. That is the object and purpose of the bill.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I do.

Mr. GARD. Could not these organizations apply and acquire by purchase the proper amount of ground for these sanitariums?

Mr. RAKER. There are places in the public domain which can not be bought, because the Government owns them. The places are ideal for these hospitals and sanitariums, particularly for consumption and other diseases, that they may be located away from the populous centers, and where these organizations desire to provide for their members as they are doing in other places.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. DENISON. I understood the Government thought that Dawsonsprings, Ky., was about the best place.

Mr. RAKER. Well, if private organizations and institutions take the Government land and pay for it and put up sanitariums for the purpose of protecting and providing for their members, without any expense to the Government, clearly there should be no objection. That is the object and purpose of this legislation.

Mr. DENISON. I understand there is lots of land around Dawsonsprings upon which other sanitariums could be put for these organizations. I understand it is cheap.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. BARBOUR. Would this privilege include the Grand Army?

Mr. RAKER. It would. It was so understood and was so considered by the committee when this bill was under consideration.

Mr. BARBOUR. I do not find that the Grand Army or the Spanish-American War Veterans are said to desire to establish a hospital on public lands, and for that reason I ask the gentleman if the Spanish-American War Veterans and the Grand Army and other institutions of that kind would be included within the scope of this resolution. Is it the gentleman's construction that they are included?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I think they are included.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have read the report accompanying this bill, and I see in it letters from the Secretary of the Interior and some others whose opinions have been asked respecting the bill. But I see here no report from the Secretary of Agriculture, who has charge of the national forests. The Secretary's opinion was asked, was it not?

Mr. RAKER. It was. The gentleman from Michigan now raises the objection on the other side that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] raised, because we took the department's construction of the bill. It has been my contention in the Committee on Public Lands that the committee could draw bills, but the committee, practically unanimously, held that we should get the department's form of the bill, regardless of what we might draw, and therefore in this particular legislation the committee thought it proper and wise to use any part of the public domain where it could be used for the purposes here designated, and they acted accordingly.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is true, is it not, that the report of the Secretary of the Interior was favorable if certain amendments were made?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; and we made them.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And the report of the Secretary of Agriculture was unfavorable, but the Secretary's letter does not appear in the report. Will the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. RAKER. I did not think it was necessary. In further answer to that, some of us have lived in and about the national forests longer than any men in the Department of Agriculture, and they know that if you can put a sanitarium in one of these national forests or other places, where one of these organizations can put a hundred or two hundred men and keep them and give them a new lease of life and practically cure them, it ought to be done.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman has not answered the question why the favorable letter from the Secretary of the Interior was included in the committee's report and why the unfavorable letter of the Secretary of Agriculture was not included.

Mr. RAKER. I will answer that frankly. I am not always in the habit of furnishing what the others say adversely to me. The committee acted, and I thought that sufficient in this instance. I would make the report for the committee in the same way it was made last Congress.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I supposed it would be the purpose of the gentleman to give the House all information available from the departments, and not a one-sided report.

Mr. RAKER. I am going just as far as I can to meet the views of the House, and since the gentleman has asked me what was the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture on that proposition I will say that the House once before unanimously passed a similar bill, and the committee has twice reported it out favorably, and therefore I adopted this course, which I believe was proper and right.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman will pardon me. One of the amendments suggested by the Secretary of the Interior and assented to by the committee was the insertion of the word "unreserved" in line 7 on page 1, so that these locations could not be made on reserved lands if under the control of the Secretary of the Interior. But as to the land under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture, selections and locations can be made upon lands that have been reserved for particular purposes and are under the control of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RAKER. May I answer the gentleman's question on that?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This reserved land relates to parks and places of that kind, where neither the committee nor anyone else would want to put a sanitarium. The lands we had in mind are forest reservations, some of them in extent larger than many of the States, and the committee believed, basing their judgment upon the wisdom of those who lived in and about these places, that it would not in the slightest degree affect

the forest reserves, and use should be made of this land where it will not affect the reserves in the least degree.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If this resolution should become a law it would permit the taking of areas of land which were purchased under the Weeks Act, better known as the Appalachian lands, acquired by the Government for particular purposes. If it should be the wish of any of these organizations to acquire and devote to their own use some of those lands they could be acquired. Is not that true?

Mr. RAKER. I think it would be.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Bringing it right down to brass tacks, will the gentleman consent to the elimination of the words, on lines 8 and 9 of page 1, "or lands on forest reservations"?

Mr. RAKER. If anybody should object, of course, the bill would go over. I would rather not, but if the gentleman insists upon it I must.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If the gentleman will accept that amendment, I shall not make an objection to the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman inform the House of the report of the Secretary of Agriculture about this matter?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I looked for it in the report of the committee, but I do not find it. But I have a copy of the Secretary's letter to the chairman of the committee, and it is unfavorable.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman read it, if he has time?

Mr. MANN. It is a long letter.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It covers about four pages of closely typewritten matter. It contains lots of good reasons for opposing the bill unless it be amended. I still reserve my right to object.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that this is the same bill that was pending in the last Congress. Is that correct?

At that time, when the bill was reported, I examined it and it seemed to me that it ought to have been referred to the Secretary of Agriculture. As there was nothing from the Secretary of Agriculture in the report, I took the liberty myself of referring it to the Secretary of Agriculture and asked for information on the bill; and in reply I was sent a copy of a letter which the Secretary of Agriculture had sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, addressed to the committee. I thought then, and I think now, that it was a breach of good faith to report the bill back to the House favorably without including in the report a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture giving the reasons why, in his judgment, it should not pass. I am surprised that a committee of this House, having referred a bill to the head of a department, and having received a letter giving information upon the subject, should decline to give it to the House for the information of the House because the committee did not agree with the reasoning of the Secretary of the department. It is a lack of good faith to the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly, if I have the floor.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. In the first place, I want to say that I very largely agree with what the gentleman says, but I do not think he ought to criticize the committee. I do not think my good friend from Oregon, who does not seem to be on the floor just now, should be held up to criticism.

Mr. RAKER. He ought not to be held up to criticism. I will answer that clearly.

Mr. MANN. The House has the report from the committee. The committee adopts the report. The House has a right to rely upon the report of the committee, and when a committee has information of that kind and refuses to submit it to the House, it tries to take advantage of the House.

Mr. RAKER. The committee does not desire to take any advantage of the House. The committee desires to present fully to the House all the information it has.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. The House never would have known from the report of the committee that the Secretary of Agriculture had been asked his opinion upon the bill and had given very good reasons, as it seemed to me at the time, why the bill ought not to pass in its then form and in its present form. That is a matter of opinion, but it is not a matter of opinion whether a committee having information about a bill fails to give the information to the House because it does not agree with the opinion of the committee. It is a matter of good faith to the House.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. ELSTON. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. McARTHUR. I demand the regular order.

Mr. ELSTON. I should like to ask the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. The question is, Is there objection?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If the gentleman will consent to the amendment which I suggest, then I will not object; otherwise, I will.

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CAREW, for one day, to attend the funeral of Hon. Edward J. Gilmore, of New York City.

BRIDGE ACROSS PERDIDO RIVER, NUNEZ FERRY, ALA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1362) to authorize Hiram I. Sage, a citizen of Baldwin County, Ala., to construct and maintain a bridge across the Perdido River at or near Nunez Ferry.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask why it is that the bill authorizes the maintaining of a toll bridge? What is the necessity for that?

Mr. ESCH. The general bridge act of March, 1906, which gives the consent of Congress to the construction of bridges, does not designate the character of the bridge. It may be a railway bridge, a highway bridge, or a bridge on which tolls are exacted. I do not know the local situation with reference to this particular bridge, but it is not unique in that respect. The committee heretofore has reported bills authorizing the construction of bridges of this character.

Mr. GARD. I was asking more immediately about the particulars of this bridge. Can the gentleman advise me about the Perdido River and the necessity for allowing a toll bridge to be constructed at this point?

Mr. ESCH. If there is any gentleman from Alabama or Louisiana present, he can give that information better than I. I sent word to Gov. SANDERS, of Louisiana, that this bill was coming up, but I understand he is not on the floor.

Mr. GARD. I ask that the bill be passed without prejudice.

Mr. ESCH. It can be passed temporarily, until Gov. SANDERS comes in.

Mr. GARD. I ask that the bill be laid aside until the author of the report [Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana] is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? There was no objection.

POSTAL SERVICE IN HAWAII.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7972) to improve the administration of the postal service in the Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STEENERSON. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is hereby directed to establish in the Islands of Hawaii, under appropriate regulations to be prescribed by him, such branch offices, nonaccounting offices, or stations of Honolulu as in his judgment may be necessary to improve the service and as may be required for the convenience of the public: *Provided, however,* That such branches, nonaccounting offices, and stations shall be conducted under the name of the existing post offices affected so as to maintain the identity of the offices concerned.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is approved by the Post Office Department as one which will facilitate the improvement of post-office service in Hawaii. Existing law requires that every post office must make its report to Washington. The distance is so great to Hawaii that it is believed by the Post Office Department that it will greatly facilitate the transaction of business to have Hawaii report to Honolulu, the capital of Hawaii. If there are any questions to be asked about it, I would yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KALANIANA'OLE]. If not, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STEENERSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

DRAINAGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ARKANSAS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 3175) authorizing local drainage districts to drain certain public lands in the State of Arkansas, counties of Mississippi and Poinsett, and subjecting said lands to taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the author of the bill or those having charge of it to advise the House of the necessity for a change in existing law, so far as this particular bill is concerned.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to make subject to the provisions of the law of the State of Arkansas certain unpatented lands in the counties of Mississippi and Poinsett. All these lands lie along either the Little River or the St. Francis River. They are wet and unsuited to cultivation. The drainage districts have been established in that State and they seek to reclaim all of these lands and make them suitable for cultivation. Quite a large body of land lies in Mississippi County and in Poinsett County, next to the lake and near the river. The people who have gone upon these lands for the purpose of making homestead entries have asked that this bill be passed. If it is passed their lands will be included within the drainage districts and reclaimed. If the bill is not passed their lands will be left outside the improvement district and will be perfectly worthless. Therefore, at the request of the people who are to be affected, the bill was introduced and has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and so far as I know no objection of any sort has been urged to the passage of the bill.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. GARD. I notice that in the communication from the acting Secretary of the Interior, of date May 25, 1918, he suggests a redraft of the bill.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; and this bill is the redraft. This is the bill that the Department of the Interior wishes. I introduced a bill following very closely after the reclamation act affecting lands in Minnesota. The department said there had been some administrative features of that bill that had proved not satisfactory, and it wrote this bill and sent it down and the committee accepted it.

Mr. GARD. Has there been any report on the bill since May 25, 1918?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes. The report is of date July 29, 1919.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Have entries been made upon these public lands?

Mr. CARAWAY. Practically on all of them. On part of the lands no entry has been made. Most of the lands, however, are in the possession of entrymen?

Mr. BARBOUR. To what extent are the lands not in possession of entrymen?

Mr. CARAWAY. I shall have to guess at that—possibly 1,000 acres, maybe 1,500, and it might not be more than five or six hundred.

Mr. BARBOUR. How would the drainage district seek to collect that tax from the Federal Government if the Federal Government did not pay it? Would it sell the land?

Mr. CARAWAY. The bill itself provides that the lands may be sold as lands are sold where they are under private ownership because of failure to pay the betterments.

The only restriction affecting these lands is that the land must be sold to some one who is qualified to make an entry and in tracts not larger than 160 acres.

Mr. BARBOUR. Has the Secretary of the Interior approved this bill?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all of those unentered, unreserved public lands, and all of those entered lands for which no final certificates have been issued, within the areas hereinafter described, are hereby made and declared to be subject to the laws of the State of Arkansas relating to the organization, government, and regulation of drainage districts to the same extent and in the same manner, except as hereinafter provided, in which lands held under private ownership are or may be subject to said laws: *Provided*, That the United States and all persons legally holding unpatented lands under entries made under the public-land laws of the United States shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, and benefits given by said laws to persons holding lands in private ownership, said lands being those public lands in Mississippi County, Ark., in townships 14, 15, and 16 north, range 9 east, and townships 15 and 16 north, range 10 east, fifth principal meridian, according to the official surveys thereof approved October 12, 1915, and all of those unentered public lands, and all of those entered lands for which no final certificates have been issued in Poinsett County, Ark., in townships 11 and 12 north, range 6 east, fifth principal meridian, according to the official surveys thereof approved July 30, 1913.

SEC. 2. That the construction and maintenance of canals, ditches, levees, and other drainage works upon and across the lands subject to the operation of this act are hereby authorized, subject to the same conditions as are imposed by the laws of the State of Arkansas upon lands held in private ownership, and that the cost of construction and maintenance of canals, ditches, levees, and other drainage works incurred in connection with any drainage project under said laws shall be equitably apportioned among all lands held in private ownership, all unentered public lands, and all lands embraced in unpatented entries affected by such project. Officially certified lists showing the amount of charges assessed against each smallest legal subdivision of such lands shall be furnished to the register and receiver of the United States land office of the district in which the lands affected are situated as soon as said charges would become a lien if the lands were held in private ownership.

SEC. 3. That all charges legally assessed pursuant to the drainage laws of the State of Arkansas by a drainage district against any unentered public lands, or against any lands embraced in unpatented entries, subject to the provisions of this act, shall be a lien upon said lands, which may be enforced by sale in the same manner and subject to the same conditions, except as hereinafter set forth, under which said charges shall be enforced against lands held in private ownership, and whenever any of said lands shall be sold for nonpayment of such charges, inclusive of lands bid in for a drainage district, a statement showing the name of the purchaser, the price at which each legal subdivision was sold, the amount assessed against it, together with penalties and interest, if any, and the cost of the sale, and the amount of excess, if any, over and above all lawful assessment charges and the cost of sale, shall be officially certified to the register and receiver of the United States land office of the district in which the lands are situated immediately after the completion of such sale, but nothing in this act shall be construed as creating any obligation on the United States to pay any of said charges.

SEC. 4. That all moneys received from the sale of entered or unentered lands subject to the operation of this act which shall be in excess of assessments due thereon, together with penalties and interest and the costs of the sales, shall be paid by the proper county officer to the receiver of the United States land office of the district in which the lands are situated, and such excess moneys shall be covered into the United States Treasury as proceeds from the sales of public lands.

SEC. 5. That at any time within 90 days after the sale of unentered public lands and at any time within 90 days after the expiration of the period of redemption provided for in the drainage laws under which the lands are sold, no redemption having been made, after the sale of lands embraced within unpatented entries, the purchaser at such sale, a drainage district being herein expressly excepted from the operation of this provision, shall, upon the filing of an application therefor and an affidavit containing proof of necessary qualifications with the register and receiver of the United States land office, and upon payment to the receiver of the price of \$5 per acre, together with the usual fees and commissions charged in entry of lands under the homestead laws, be entitled to receive a patent: *Provided*, That such purchaser shall have the qualifications required in making entry of lands under the homestead laws, and any such purchase shall exhaust any further homestead right of the purchaser to the extent of the amount of lands thus purchased by him. Not more than 160 acres of such lands shall be sold and patented to any one purchaser under the provisions of this act. This limitation shall not apply to lands subject to the operation of this act which may be bid in for a drainage district, but no patent shall be issued to a drainage district or to any one bidding in said lands for a drainage district. The proceeds derived by the Government shall be covered into the United States Treasury and applied as provided by law for the disposal of the proceeds from the sale of public lands.

SEC. 6. That unless the purchaser shall, within the time specified in section 5 of this act, file with the register and receiver of the United States land office an application for a patent, together with the required affidavit, and make payment of the purchase price, fees, and commissions as provided in said section 5, any person having the qualifications of an entryman under the homestead laws may file an application for a patent, together with the required affidavit, and upon payment to the receiver of the purchase price of \$5 per acre, fees, and commissions, and in addition thereto an amount equal to the drainage charges, penalties, interest, and costs for which the lands were sold, and if the lands were bid in for the drainage district, an additional amount equal to 6 per cent per annum on the sum for which the lands were sold from the date of such sale, said applicant shall become subrogated to the rights of such purchaser and shall be entitled to receive a patent for not more than 160 acres of said lands. When payment is made to effect subrogation as herein provided, the register and receiver of the United States land office shall serve notice upon the purchaser that an application for patent for the lands purchased by him has been filed, and that the amount of the drainage charges, penalties, interests, and costs of the sale will be paid to him upon submission of proof of purchase and payment by him of said sums. The receiver shall make such payment as soon as said requirement shall have been fulfilled. If the lands were bid in for a drainage district, the receiver will pay to the proper county officers the amount of the drainage charges, penalties, and interests and costs of sale, together with the additional sum of 6 per cent per annum, to which said drainage district is entitled. All remaining moneys to which the United States may be entitled shall be covered into

the United States Treasury and applied as provided by law for the disposal of the proceeds from the sale of public lands.

Sec. 7. That a copy of all notices required by the drainage laws of the State of Arkansas to be given to the owners and occupants of lands held in private ownership shall, as soon as such notice is issued, be delivered to the register and receiver of the United States land office of the district in which the lands are situated where any of the lands subject to the operation of this act are affected, and the United States and the entryman claiming under the public land laws of the United States shall be accorded the same rights to be heard by petition, answer, remonstrance, appeal, or otherwise, as are given to persons holding lands in private ownership, and all entrymen shall be given the same rights of redemption as are given to the owners of land held in private ownership.

Sec. 8. That this act shall not be effective as to any lands involved in suits instituted on behalf of the United States with a view to quieting title in the Government to such lands until and unless such suits shall be finally determined in favor of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "drainage," insert the words "and road."

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that it was the intention to amend this bill so as to make all of its provisions applicable to road improvements as well as to drainage improvements, and I would suggest the amendment "and road" be inserted after the word "drainage" throughout the bill. I move to amend, on page 2, line 22, by inserting the words "and road" after the word "drainage."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARAWAY: On page 2, line 22, after the word "drainage," insert the words "and road."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, we could not hear the amendment read, and we could not hear a word that the gentleman from Arkansas stated in reference to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARAWAY: On page 2, line 22, after the word "drainage," insert the words "and road."

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit me to remake my statement? On page 1, line 8, after the word "drainage," the committee inserted the words "and road," to make it read "drainage and road districts."

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman this?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Are drainage and road districts distinct, or is there a drainage and road district?

Mr. CARAWAY. They are distinct districts. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will state there is a general law in Arkansas under which people may organize improvement districts for the purpose of draining the land or for building public highways. And the purpose of this act is to make these lands subject to the betterment charges for both road and drainage districts.

Mr. MANN. Well, we have heretofore passed laws relating to lands in Minnesota, and possibly elsewhere, giving the right to make assessment charges against the property owned by the district for drainage purposes. Have we heretofore anywhere, so far as the gentleman knows, given such a right for road purposes?

Mr. CARAWAY. I am sure we have not, sir.

Mr. MANN. Well, this is a distinct departure?

Mr. CARAWAY. It is, sir, if the gentleman will permit me. Our State has recently made provision for about \$80,000,000 worth of highway improvements, and, what is strange, the people who are to pay this assessment to build these roads seem to be willing to be taxed for that purpose, and these lands that are to be reclaimed would be denied the right to go into improvement districts that seek to build hard surface roads.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is very strange. People often seek the right to organize districts and issue bonds for public improvements, but I think it would be very strange if the people with pleasure pay the taxes for these bonds issued for these roads long after the roads are worn out. That is what they will be doing. However, the people of Arkansas at the present time will feel good but when they finally pay for these improvements they will cuss the men who authorized them.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, anyway, they have not the improvements and until they get them they believe they want them.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Is not the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas rather inconsistent with the purpose of the bill since the amendment provides for the cost of construction and maintenance of roads, whereas the language of the bill in section 1 and section 2 provides merely for the construction and maintenance of canals, ditches, levees, and other drainage work?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no; in section 1 it says in line 8, "and roads."

Mr. GARD. Drainage and road districts, not roads. I would suggest that the gentleman proceed with the bill as it is rather than seek to incorporate the cost of construction of roads in this bill when manifestly it was not intended so to be done.

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, of course, I have explained to the gentleman the bill as originally drawn provided merely for drainage reclamation.

Mr. GARD. I do not desire to object to the consideration of the bill, but I shall object to a vote upon the bill unless the gentleman will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. CARAWAY. If I remember, the time for the gentleman to object is gone. He can vote the amendment down if he can.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is too late to object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROMJUE. Does not the gentleman think, in section 2, that if this amendment is adopted the amendment also should follow after "drainage," in line 17, section 2?

Mr. CARAWAY. I have marked the places where it should go in.

Mr. ROMJUE. If the gentleman will read that section—
Mr. CARAWAY (reading)—

That the construction and maintenance of canals, districts, levees, and other drainage work upon and across the land subject to the operations of this act are hereby authorized.

And so forth.

It would have to be so amended. I want to say this to the House: Primarily the bill, as I have said over and over again, is to get reclamation for the purpose of drainage alone. At the request of the people who were interested I undertook to have it amended. I am vitally interested that it shall pass with reference to the drainage, and I should very much like to see it pass with roads included. If there are any gentlemen on the floor who are certain they know more about what the people down there in Mississippi and Poinsett Counties need and want than I know, where I was raised, why, God bless their souls, they can amend the bill. I have no earthly interest in it except to try to record the wishes of the people there and to give them a chance to develop lands that are absolutely useless now, and will be entirely useless especially if they are not included in the present reclamation projects that are now going on, because they are in such narrow strips it would be impossible after the levees have been constructed and the ditches dug to make another drainage district to include them. They could not carry the cost.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

I think this bill is very similar to the bill that passed in relation to lands in Minnesota, introduced, I think, by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD].

Mr. CARAWAY. It was called to my attention, and the department said there were certain administrative features of law that did not work well, and it was changed in that respect.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Minnesota tells me that this situation arose in Minnesota, that where the ditches were dug spoil was thrown over to one side, where it could be used for making a road. But in some cases I think the assessment was defeated because they smoothed down the spoil and made a road. It may be the purpose of inserting "road" here is not to organize a separate road district as stated by my distinguished friend from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY], but to authorize the drainage district to construct a road out of the spoil, which would seem a very desirable thing to do.

Mr. CARAWAY. That was not the object of the legislation, because that soil is so soft you can not build the road that way. I wish it were possible, but you can not do it.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, what is purposed under this bill in the matter of drainage is provided for by the act approved August 11, 1916, in connection with lands requiring reclamation by irrigation. And I wondered why some of the provisions of that bill of August 11, 1916, were not followed in this bill, and particularly in the matter of the laying of obligations on the public lands, and, second, of the disposition of the public lands after the levy has been made and the lands have been sold. Under the irrigation act I have referred to no public lands may be subjected to liens contemplated until the Secretary of the Interior has approved the plans of reclamation and has satisfied himself that the work is feasible, and that the public lands that it proposes to place the lien upon are lands that may be properly brought within the area of reclamation. There are very good reasons for that provision, because without

a provision of that kind there is a temptation, even if everyone connected with the enterprise is very conscientious and very conservative, to include in the area public lands the reclamation of which is questionable and by including them spread the cost over a larger area and make it to appear to be less than it actually is per acre of the lands that can be actually reclaimed.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. In the first place, I am frank to say that I was ignorant of the provisions of the law to which the gentleman refers. In the next place, there is no temptation to do that in this case, because it costs money to include these lands, and unless they are subject to be reclaimed they will be absolutely worthless after being included, as they are worthless now, and therefore the people who are to pay the expense of this reclamation—every dollar of it—would be throwing their money away by including land that could not be reclaimed.

Mr. MONDELL. Not necessarily. If people were not entirely conscientious, or if they were over-optimistic, they would be tempted to spread their contemplated or proposed or suggested reclamation over a large area, with a view of appearing to make the cost per acre low.

Now, if a part of the burden could be permanently attached to lands that are not actually reclaimable, that would be a relief to the people who own the lands that can be reclaimed, or if that were not possible, and I realize that it would not be an easy thing to do, there is at least a temptation to make the project appear to be feasible and inviting, when, as a matter of fact, the facts may be otherwise.

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. To start in with, these projects are already established. The assessments have been made. It is a question of whether these lands shall be included or not. Therefore that temptation is gone. The next provision of the bill is that the Government does not have to pay one cent. The only way it could get anything would be to sell the lands; and if the lands were not reclaimed, it could not sell them for 5 cents an acre. And, therefore, if the people who are to pay for the reclamation, whose lands are to be charged with the betterments, would go out and spread this betterment or this apparent reclamation over lands that were entirely worthless, they ought to be in a home for the feeble-minded, because they would be fooling nobody but themselves and laying no burden on anyone but themselves.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, now, that may be true in this particular case.

Mr. CARAWAY. In this case it is.

Mr. MONDELL. It is not true by and large, and it is because it is not true that the committee having to do with the law that provided for the levying of the cost of irrigation reclamation on public lands was very careful not to place any such temptation in the way of irrigation promoters.

One thing more: I am fairly well satisfied, although not entirely so, with the statement made in regard to the situation in this particular case. But I want to make one other suggestion to him. He may be entirely right. I do not clearly understand the purpose of the provision of section 5, page 4, which lays a flat charge of \$5 per acre on the public lands when entered.

On what theory was any charge placed on the public land more than their proportionate share of the burden? And, assuming that it be wise and proper to place a sale price on those lands over and above their burden of reclamation, why was the price fixed at \$5 per acre?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the gentleman will permit, the net charge of \$5 an acre was put on it by the department here. The provisions of the bill, if the gentleman will read it, provide that where the lands have been reclaimed and they are not entered they may be sold for the cost of reclamation. The department said that the Government ought to have something out of it, and so it arbitrarily said that as a condition of your getting a patent, after you pay the betterment charges, the Government shall have \$5 an acre out of it. It is not worth a cent, and never has been, for any purpose in the world except to hold the earth together,

and the department said that after you had gone in and paid all the betterment charges, before you get a patent you must pay the Government \$5 an acre. I do not think it ought to have been, but rather than argue with the department I accepted the department's view.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. These lands affected by the bill are confined to one county in the State of Arkansas?

Mr. CARAWAY. No. They are in two counties—Mississippi County and Poinsett County.

Mr. ELSTON. What is the total acreage of the lands?

Mr. CARAWAY. If the gentleman will read the description he will get that. I do not recall it.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, in general the land lies in swamp areas along a river?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. So that the reclamation and drainage contemplated are intended to take the water off the land, which is probably alluvial land of good quality, so that it may be cultivated?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman contend that after all the reclamation and drainage are done, and the land made fit for cultivation, it is worth only \$5 in addition to the drainage or reclamation cost?

Mr. CARAWAY. Well, now, I do not know. I am not going to assert that or to deny it. I do not know what it will be worth after it is reclaimed, and I do not know what it will cost to reclaim it.

Mr. ELSTON. In general, what will be the figure for its reclamation, if the gentleman knows?

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not know. It requires the building of a high levee and innumerable ditches; how many I do not know.

Mr. ELSTON. Twenty-five or thirty dollars an acre?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, I am sure it will be that much.

Mr. ELSTON. Then \$5 in addition to that would probably make good rich valley soil purchasable by this preferred applicant at \$30 an acre. Does the gentleman think that is fair?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Arkansas allow me to use just a moment of my time now?

Mr. CARAWAY. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit just a question?

Mr. MONDELL. The ordinary price of public land is \$1.25. Here one is supposed to give \$4 additional.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; this land has lain there for nearly a hundred years, and nobody has been found silly enough to take it.

Mr. MONDELL. What the gentleman from Arkansas says, I think, answers the inquiry of the gentleman from California [Mr. Elston] to a certain extent at least. This land has been subject to acquisition by anyone desirous of utilizing it since the morning stars sang together, and it has been subject to the homestead law since the year 1864, and no one has seen fit to take it; and I think it may be a fair assumption that the land is probably worth a little more than the cost of reclamation, if it is worth the cost of reclamation; and that is why I inquired why the charge is \$5 an acre rather than the usual \$1.25 per acre, where a title is granted without full compliance with the homestead law. I assume that it is upon the theory there may be some little unearned increment there which the Government ought to have, and it may be partly on the theory that under the law the purchaser, while he must be a qualified homestead entryman and exhaust his homestead rights by using it on this land, receives a patent immediately upon the purchase and without the necessity of the usual homestead residence, and that is a privilege for a release from an obligation which has some cash value. It is possible on that theory that the price is fixed at \$5, an arbitrary price of \$5, rather than \$1.25.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is possibly true.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman answer another question?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. I understand from this colloquy that the land is now subject to entry to anyone who wants to go on it and take it. Is that true?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. It is not reserved or withdrawn?

Mr. CARAWAY. No.

Mr. ELSTON. Would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment to the effect that the price shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, substituting for the price of \$5 an acre a price to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, I tell you, if you are going to reclaim this land and try to sell it, there ought to be no strings tied to it.

When the purchaser goes in and pays the betterment charges, he ought to know for what price he will get it.

Mr. ELSTON. The Secretary might fix a price.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; and possibly it might be prohibitive.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Why was not the price fixed at \$1.25 an acre, the same as arid land, when reclaimed under the desert-land law?

Mr. McPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. McPHERSON. In the absence of some safeguard, such as is contained in the previous legislation, what would hinder the owners in this case from including within these boundaries public land that did not need reclamation?

Mr. CARAWAY. Because, to start in with, there are no such lands in that country. That would be a complete answer.

Mr. McPHERSON. The gentleman admits that Congress has not prevented the possibility of fraud that would include other lands?

Mr. CARAWAY. I only answered the gentleman's question halfway. I said there are no such lands, and therefore it is an impossibility. In the next place, the drainage promoters, as the gentleman calls them, have absolutely no interest in it.

Mr. McPHERSON. Who lays out the boundaries of the drainage district?

Mr. CARAWAY. That is what I am going to tell you. The people who are to be affected, whose lands are to be reclaimed, get together and form a drainage association and go before the court and have a drainage district established. There is not a dollar of profit in it to anybody. It is just simply a question of reclamation. There are no public funds for anybody to handle, nothing for anybody to get, no issuing of stock or paying of dividends. They all go in and pay whatever it costs to reclaim their lands and assess it among themselves.

Mr. McPHERSON. One more question.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. McPHERSON. Does the gentleman mean to say it is true that under the drainage law no lands can be included within this district except such as are petitioned by the owners to be included?

Mr. CARAWAY. I never intended to say that. If I said it, I did not intend to. I said that the districts are established by landowners. Nobody else has a right to participate in this organization, because it costs nobody else anything. They get together and file a petition in court and give notice that they are going to ask for an order of the court to create a drainage district; and when the hearing comes on the owners of all the lands that are sought to be included are notified. If they are included in the district, they can appeal that question if they want to. Then, if they are included, when the assessments of betterments are made by assessors, who are appointed by the court, notice is given, and they have a right to contest the amount of their assessment. But what I did try to say was that it was not a profit-creating concern. There is no reason why lands that can not be reclaimed and can not be valuable should be included, because if they can not be reclaimed and can not be made to yield revenue you would be enlarging your district at an expense and getting back nothing out of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words. I have had some experience in reclamation districts, and I am somewhat concerned as to what may happen to the Federal Government if it goes into this district, if this district is like some others with which I have had experience. Will the Federal Government have a right to vote upon district matters?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, no.

Mr. BARBOUR. Do the landowners within the district have the right to elect the trustees of the district?

Mr. CARAWAY. No.

Mr. BARBOUR. Who governs or controls that?

Mr. CARAWAY. The court appoints the commissioners, and after the commissioners are appointed to fix the boundaries of the district then assessors are appointed who assess the benefits.

Mr. BARBOUR. Are the assessors appointed by the court?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Has the landowner a right to appear before the court and object?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Object to any assessor?

Mr. CARAWAY. He has a right to object to everything. He has no right to go before the court and say, "I want John Smith instead of Bill Jones to assess the betterment"; but if there is any reason why the court should not appoint any man as an assessor, anybody would have the right to object to

him, to show that he was not competent, or that he was not honest, or that he was interested in the result, or anything of that kind.

Mr. BARBOUR. Then, as I understand, the district is organized or founded by an order of the court?

Mr. CARAWAY. That is it.

Mr. BARBOUR. And I notice here that the bill provides that the maintenance of the reclamation work shall be paid for by the lands public and private within the district?

Mr. CARAWAY. That is true. The assessments for that purpose are referred to the court.

Mr. BARBOUR. And the benefits received by the owners of the various tracts of land are determined.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is it. The assessors divide the lands into 40-acre tracts, or smaller as the case may be if they are city lots, and then they assess the betterments against them. The owners of the land are notified that their assessments have been made, and that they may come into court and show that they have been overassessed if they can.

Mr. BARBOUR. And the United States Government would have the right to come before the court the same as the owner of any private tract?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. And to show that the assessment placed on the Government land is excessive?

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course; but if you will look at the provisions of the bill you will see that the bill provides that the ownership shall pass out of the Government as soon as the district is created, because whenever the betterments are assessed the Government lands are sold for the payment of these betterments, plus \$5 an acre, which goes into the Federal Treasury.

Mr. BARBOUR. These questions occurred to me after hearing the suggestion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] that some power or control over these should be reserved in the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Secretary of the Interior is to have no interest in it, because so soon as the betterments are assessed—

Mr. BARBOUR. The lands are to be sold.

Mr. CARAWAY. The lands are to be sold and will pass into private ownership.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman to say earlier in the discussion that these lands in the main had been entered.

Mr. CARAWAY. Most of them have.

Mr. MONDELL. And, as a matter of fact, entrymen would then appear on their own behalf as any other owner would.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. And the only case in which the provision to which the gentleman has referred would apply would be a case where the land was not entered up to the time that the assessments were levied—and there are not likely to be many cases of that sort—or cases where the entryman, for some reason or other, fails to perfect his entry.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is true.

Mr. MONDELL. If the situation is a fairly reasonable and favorable one, I assume there will be very few of those cases.

Mr. CARAWAY. If the land has any value at all, I am sure some one will enter upon it, because he can do it up to the day of sale.

Mr. MONDELL. And the entryman that now occupies the land will, of course, protect himself, as any other owner would, and would proceed to pay his share of the assessments as any other owner would?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes. I would like to say this: I was asked to introduce this bill by the commissioners who were to establish the district. I declined to do that until every man living up to it had requested that it should be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] stated that he did not know how much acreage owned by the Government was covered by this bill. It does not seem to be in any of the letters in the report. As I understand, these are a part of the so-called "sunk" lands of Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. They are very valuable if they can be drained.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; extremely so; and absolutely worthless unless they can be.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, of course these lands are in connection with private lands. Private lands can not very well be drained without the draining of the Government lands, and the

Government lands can not be well drained without the drainage of the private lands. It is perfectly proper that the two should be combined in forming a drainage district. The letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior states, quoting, I think, from the language of the petition that was filed—

that the lands in their present condition are unfit for cultivation and will remain so until drained; that they will be very valuable for agricultural purposes when drained and their value will be greatly enhanced.

Even in my short time I can remember when lands down in Illinois before they were drained sold for \$15 or \$20 an acre after I became a voting citizen. Those lands are now worth four or five hundred dollars an acre. These lands when they are drained will be extremely valuable. They are bottom lands and are very rich. The cost of drainage is fairly high, but I take it it will be far less than the value of the lands when drained. I think it is a good scheme for the Government to join with the other owners in Arkansas in the drainage of the lands, but I question very much whether the Government ought to give the lands away. That is what is being done by this bill. Of course, a few people will be benefited. They will get lands worth \$50 to \$100 an acre, or perhaps more, at an expense of \$25 or \$30 an acre or perhaps less, perhaps more; I do not know. The lands will be worth a great deal more, and it is idle to say that these lands have been there since day first dawned and that no one has cultivated them. Since they sank, a good many years ago, they have not been subject to cultivation and are not now and will not be until they are drained. But I suppose the Government will go on and make the lands especially valuable by some particular act of Government and then give them away.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have more than 60 men here when doing public business, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLANTON (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point. If the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] wants to conduct business with 60 men present, it is his affair.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I think 60 intelligent gentlemen in the examination of the details of a bill constitute a fair average attendance in the House under the circumstances.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest that the gentleman from Texas has withdrawn his point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. As I look over the assemblage and see the leader of the minority here—

Mr. BLANTON. He is always here.

Mr. MONDELL. And the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] present, as well as other distinguished gentlemen, I am sure that the gentlemen who are here are fully qualified to transact the business before the House in an intelligent way.

I want to take the time of the House for only a moment in regard to some suggestions made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who has just taken his seat. These lands have had a curious history. At one time a large portion of them was granted to the State of Arkansas as swamp lands, and the State sold them. Then a claim was made by the Federal Government that the survey under which the grant to Arkansas was made was erroneous. We had a resurvey of the lands and they were taken from the original claimants under the State and opened to homestead settlement. Since the beginning of settlements in that particular part of the world these lands have been open to entry, freely open to entry. We tried to get rid of them by giving them to the State of Arkansas. Up to this good hour they have been of very little use to the world except to occupy a portion of the surface of the earth and to hold mother earth together.

It is proposed to reclaim them. Nobody knows whether or not the lands when reclaimed will be worth very much more than the cost of reclamation. In any event, they are in the main now held by settlers who could get a patent to them without the payment of a dollar to the Government. But this bill enables the State of Arkansas to bring these areas within its drainage laws. The only fear I have in a case of this kind is not that the people of the country as a whole may not get a few dollars of the earned or unearned increment, but that by no possibility no obligation shall be placed on the Federal Government with reference to these lands. And that seems to be guarded against in the bill; and that being done, I think that we ought to favor a piece of legislation which simply places the unpatented lands on the same basis as the patented lands; and in addition to that lays an obligation on the purchaser that he shall have the qualifications of a homestead settler and shall pay \$5 an acre. I think it is a very fair proposition.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman favor the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas to include the construction of roads in addition to canals, ditches, levees, and so forth?

Mr. CARAWAY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I am going to strike out that in deference to the gentleman from Ohio, who knows so much more about it than I do. And I now, Mr. Speaker, move, on page 1, line 8, to strike out the committee amendment, "and road," and leave it purely a drainage proposition.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. The Chair understands the gentleman from Arkansas means that he does not desire that it shall be adopted?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARAWAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FRATERNAL SANITARIUMS ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RAKER. In regard to the bill that was up some time ago pertaining to national sanitariums. I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain on the calendar and go to the foot, not to be considered until the next regular calendar day.

The SPEAKER. Which bill is that?

Mr. RAKER. The bill is H. R. 1125, No. 31 on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, which was stricken off the calendar, be allowed to remain upon the calendar and go to the foot. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I call the attention of the gentleman from California—I do not know what line it is, but on the upper part of page 2 of the bill, where it speaks of societies, institutions that may avail themselves of the benefit of the bill having the right to have sanitariums on the land referred to being organized for no profit, would not the gentleman accept an amendment there so as to provide that these societies not only shall not be organized for profit but shall be maintained and conducted without profit?

Mr. RAKER. That particular amendment was placed by the Senate Committee on Public Lands at the request of Senator Works, and when the bill comes up the matter can be discussed then. Of course, it can not come up now.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman will appreciate that the bill does not provide against the society that notwithstanding its being organized for no profit it may be maintained and conducted at a profit.

Mr. RAKER. I shall be pleased to take up that question with the gentleman when we come to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I think the bill should have a complete report, and I therefore object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PA.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8117) for the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Falls, Wyoming County, Pa.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a bridge, with approaches thereto, across the Susquehanna River at Falls, Wyoming County, Pa., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania" and insert "maintain, and operate"; page 1, line 6, strike out the word "with" and insert the word "and";

page 1, line 7, after the word "at," insert the words "a point suitable to the interests of navigation, and at or near"; page 1, line 8, after the word "Pennsylvania," strike out the words "at a point suitable to the interests of navigation."

The question was taken, and the committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at or near Falls, Wyoming County, Pa."

On motion of Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House for a change of reference of the bill H. R. 8423, providing additional compensation to certain employees of the Post Office Department for overtime service, and the bill H. R. 8424, for increased compensation for postal employees during the current fiscal year, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I have conferred with the chairmen of both committees and it is agreeable to them to have that transfer made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for a change of reference as stated. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. I think we should proceed with the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

BRIDGE ACROSS CUMBERLAND RIVER, TENN.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

The next bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8076) authorizing the county of Montgomery, Tenn., to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River within 7 miles of Clarksville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] the character of this bill, as to whether or not it is to be a toll bridge and what is the general necessity for the building of it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will state to the gentleman that this is to be a free bridge, constructed by the county and for the people of the county. They have already voted \$500,000 to build it. There is no bridge there now at or near the city of Clarksville. The Cumberland River runs through the county, and it is very important to have this bridge. It is a matter that has been agitated for many years there to have a bridge across the Cumberland River, so that the people on the south side can reach the city of Clarksville.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object for the purpose of asking a question, is this bridge to be built by any \$55,000 Clemenceau roosters?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. This bridge is to be paid for by the money that has been appropriated by the people of Montgomery County, and it is to come out of the county treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8076) authorizing the county of Montgomery, Tenn., to construct a bridge across the Cumberland River within 7 miles of Clarksville, Tenn.

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Montgomery, Tenn., be, and is hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Cumberland River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation and within a distance of 7 miles from Clarksville, Tenn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," and approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

INCREASED PRICE OF SHOES, SUGAR, CLOTHING, AND COFFEE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House resolution 217, directing the Federal Trade Commission to inquire into the proposed increase in price of shoes, sugar, clothing, and coffee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of this resolution?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Federal Trade Commission very recently reported, after what was, I suppose, a very careful and painstaking investigation relative to the cost of shoes, the shoe trade, shoe business, shoe prices, and I imagine that most Members have received copies of that report. Evidently the Federal Trade Commission was busily engaged in that sort of an inquiry some time before this resolution was first introduced.

It occurred to me as a little peculiar that those who had to do with the inquiry—the committee that considered it—do not seem, so far as we are informed, to have sought information from the Federal Trade Commission as to whether they were conducting any inquiries along those lines. About the time that the matter was here for consideration, a few days ago, the Federal Trade Commission suddenly burst upon us with a preliminary report on shoes. There can, of course, be no possible objection to securing all the information that is obtainable in regard to the price of shoes, leathers, and all those things that enter into the cost of shoes. It is a tremendously important subject, a subject that affects us all in these days. One of the most trying of the increases in the cost of living has related to shoes and other footwear. There has been a greater increase in that character of commodities than in almost any other. Many of us have believed that there was no justification for all that increase, and the report of the commission would seem to indicate that that is true and would seem to further indicate that the Government ought to get busy and punish those who are responsible unlawfully for these increases in cost all along the line.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. DYER. The report the gentleman refers to only covers shoes. It does not cover the other articles mentioned in the resolution.

Mr. MONDELL. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has amended the resolution as it is now before the House. The report of the committee will leave the resolution applying only to shoes, and I assume that those who are supporting the resolution are in favor of the adoption of the committee amendment, and I suppose the committee desires the resolution adopted in that way, and undoubtedly the committee has a purpose in so amending the resolution. The committee has, as a matter of fact, since this resolution was reported, reported another resolution relative to inquiries into sugar.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. So I assume that it is the purpose of the gentleman who introduced the bill and the gentleman who reported it to support the resolution in its amended form.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. IGOE. The gentleman referred to the report of the Federal Trade Commission. That report as presented is a preliminary report, or, rather, a summary of the report. If the gentleman has read it, he will learn that as to the manufacturers' cost and the financial end of the business, the investigation brings it down to include 1917 and some of the retailers' costs for 1918. The purpose of this resolution as originally introduced was to get at what is proposed for the future as well as what had already taken place, but now the report submitted does not include the increased costs for the last year and a half, which have been very great.

Mr. MONDELL. I did read the preliminary report very carefully, and I noted that while the conclusions were assumed to be based on present conditions, the facts referred to were mostly facts of a year or more ago. And I have assumed that the Federal Trade Commission is not engaging in so useless and profitless an undertaking as to make an examination and a report to Congress without bringing the examination as nearly down to date as possible. If that was not the object of the Federal Trade Commission, what was their object and purpose in giving us this preliminary and proposing this final report?

Mr. IGOE. I do not know what the object of the commission was, but the object of this resolution is to get the facts now and get them promptly if they are to be of any value.

Mr. MONDELL. I do hope and trust that out of the resolution there will come some real definite information based on facts. It will be a welcome novelty to many of us to have a Government agency thoroughly examine into and fully and fairly and intelligently report down to date the facts with regard to a situation.

Mr. McARTHUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. McARTHUR. Does the gentleman think the Federal Trade Commission can fully and fairly and intelligently report anything?

Mr. MONDELL. I am willing to give the Federal Trade Commission an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to do that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Reserving the right to object, I observe that as originally introduced the Federal Trade Commission is called upon by this bill to inquire into the increased price of sugar, clothing, and coffee, and report to the House at the earliest moment the cause and necessity for the increase. The committee reporting the bill strike out that provision. I desire to ask the introducer of the measure the reason for the elimination of that clause?

Mr. IGOE. Well, the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. DENISON] can probably explain that better than I can.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I hope he will.

Mr. IGOE. I have been anxious to get a quick report on some one article the price of which has gone up enormously, and I hoped that out of it we might be able to frame some legislation. That was the reason why the resolution was framed as it is, to get a report on shoes by September 9, and the other report at any later date, as soon as convenient.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Well, the inclusion of the inquiry as to the reason for the increased price of the other commodities would not have prevented the Federal Trade Commission from reporting upon shoes, and so I would like the gentleman reporting the measure to explain why that clause relating to clothing and sugar and the other commodities was eliminated.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, of course it is very desirable for us to have information on the prevailing prices of everything. But the committee that considered this resolution, of course, had to take into consideration the limitations that surround the Federal Trade Commission in the performance of its work, and our information was that the Federal Trade Commission is now engaged in investigations that are tremendous and far reaching, and that those investigations would so completely absorb its time that if we wanted to get anything definite and specific we had to limit the requests we were making of them.

Now, there was a resolution pending before our committee which the committee had at that time already considered asking for an investigation and report as to the prevailing prices of sugar. The committee had already had hearings upon that resolution and acted favorably upon it, and it is now pending before the House, so that that covers the question of sugar.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman says that is pending?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why is it not included here? Why does it not come up?

Mr. IGOE. I may say that the Senate has passed a resolution on sugar, and the Federal Trade Commission is now investigating that question.

Mr. ESCH. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has already reported out the Tinkham resolution, providing for an inquiry on sugar and the cost thereof.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. How about clothing?

Mr. ESCH. It is not included in that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why not include that?

Mr. ESCH. I think this would be amply broad to engage the attention of the Federal Trade Commission for some time.

Mr. DENISON. What we want to get at is a report as early as possible. We can not expect too much from the Federal Trade Commission, so that in order to get something definite we limited this to the price of shoes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. For the life of me I can not understand why you should confine the attention of the Federal Trade Commission solely to shoes at this time, when the whole country is crying out against the increased cost of sugar and clothing and other commodities that enter into the necessities of life. I can not understand why some explanation is not offered now, when the opportunity is at hand, for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, eliminating this provision, that should go hand in hand with the inquiry concerning shoes.

Mr. DENISON. Well, I will say to the gentleman from New York that if he can not understand the very plain and simple statement I have made that is the misfortune of the gentleman.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. No. The gentleman has not made any statement that would give any reason for the elimination of that.

Mr. DENISON. I intended to.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman says the Federal Trade Commission is engaged with other matters. There is nothing so important at this moment, while the mind of the community is in such a state of awful unrest, as to bring to a head something that will result in the lowering of the cost of living, in the lowering of the cost of footwear, in the lowering of the cost of

clothing and sugar, and other things that go into the necessities for life.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, we all understand the facts that the gentleman from New York states, but I thought I had a moment ago stated that we had already reported a resolution to investigate the prevailing price of sugar, and we had information to the effect that the Federal Trade Commission was so busily engaged that we could not expect it to make an investigation of the cost of everything, and, therefore, in order to get some tangible result, and get it quickly, we limited this resolution to an investigation and report on the price of shoes.

Mr. DYER. Can the gentleman tell how long it will take them to report on shoes?

Mr. DENISON. I do not know. They have already made a preliminary investigation, particularly as to the price of leather, and I did hope that they could supplement that inquiry and make a definite report at an early date as to the price of shoes. In the press of the country, particularly in the trade journals, there has been made public a prediction that the price of shoes is going to be enormously increased in the near future, and the committee thought that on account of the extraordinary price of shoes at present and the great importance of shoes to the people of the country we should call the attention of the Federal Trade Commission to that inquiry particularly and have a report on that subject as early as possible, and in order to do that we limited the resolution to the question of shoes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is right on that. I do not think there should be an objection to the inquiry. I ask for the regular order.

Mr. EMERSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman from Missouri asked for the regular order.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman from Ohio will have an opportunity to discuss the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the immediate consideration of this resolution?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the inquiry, because the inquiry is proper; but—

Mr. DYER. The gentleman can offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 217.

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby directed to inquire into the proposed increase in the price of shoes; to ascertain the cause and necessity for the proposed increase; to ascertain the manufacturers' cost price and selling price and the retailers' cost price and selling price for the years 1918 and 1919, and to report to the House not later than September 9, 1919, the result of the investigation.

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission is further directed to inquire into the increased price of sugar, clothing, and coffee, and to report to the House at the earliest date possible the cause of and necessity for the increase.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 2 strike out the word "proposed."

In line 3 strike out the word "proposed."

On line 6 strike out the word "not," and on line 7 strike out the words "later than September 9, 1919," and insert "at the earliest convenient date."

Strike out all of lines 9 to 12, inclusive, so that the resolution will read:

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby directed to inquire into the increase in the price of shoes; to ascertain the cause and necessity for the increase; to ascertain the manufacturers' cost price and selling price and the retailers' cost price and selling price for the years 1918 and 1919, and to report to the House at the earliest convenient date the result of the investigation."

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] is entitled to recognition if he desires it.

Mr. DENISON. I think I have said all that is necessary. I will be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I move to amend the resolution by adding in line 3, after the word "shoes," "clothing and food products."

Gentlemen may recall that three weeks ago to-day I made some suggestions that we should do something to reduce the cost of living. I was unmercifully abused for saying that. Since that time I have been back in my district and in consultation with the people there; and while shoes are very high, and I am in favor of an investigation of shoes, the people, just as the gentleman from New York has stated, are overwhelmingly in favor of this Congress doing something to reduce the high cost of living. It is up to this Congress to do so. We should enact some legislation along that line. If under this resolution the Federal Trade Commission can investigate nothing but

shoes, let us eliminate shoes for the present and take up the food question. It is not a question of sugar alone; it is a question of meat and a question of potatoes. The executive branch of the Government is doing everything it can to dispose of surplus supplies of food to help the situation. Butter, eggs, cheese, meat, potatoes, and all food supplies are away up beyond reason, and there is a great outcry for either an increase of wages or a reduction in the prices of food products.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. What does the gentleman suggest as a remedy to reduce the high cost of living? Does he think an investigation will do any good? How will we accomplish it?

Mr. EMERSON. I think an investigation will help.

Mr. DYER. We have had a good many of them.

Mr. EMERSON. I am in favor of anything. As I said three weeks ago to-day, I am in favor of taking the tax off of food products. I am in favor of taking the tax off of the freight rates upon food products. I am in favor of the parcel-post system of distribution of food products. I am in favor of anything that will assist in any way in the reduction of the high cost of living; and if this investigation will assist in any way, I am in favor of it; but I would amend this resolution by including food and clothing as well as shoes, with the instruction that if a preference is to be given in any investigation it shall be given in favor of food, and that the Federal Trade Commission should first investigate the cause of the high cost of living and report to this Congress some legislation or some method whereby it can be reduced. It is up to us to do that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment that has just been proposed. The country is in a state of unrest. The people generally insist upon the Congress doing something real, something actual, something tangible toward stopping the profiteering that has been going on, as well as it can be stopped by legislation and lowering the high cost of living. The press has been proclaiming loudly against the profiteering and against the ever-increasing cost of food and clothing and shoes and other articles which are necessary for men, women, and children.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Not now, but in a moment I will. We have gone through expensive investigations by the Senate, House, commissions, departments, and bureaus, and the time has come when the people want something real done. I am glad this resolution now before the House is up for consideration. As I indicated before, I would have liked to have the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce report the resolution as it was introduced by Mr. Igoe. I realize that the Federal Trade Commission has much work to do, but it could report at one time as to shoes, at another time as to clothing, and at another time as to food, if it was expedient and proper to do so. I can see no earthly reason why the Federal Trade Commission should not be now instructed by the House to report as to the increase in the cost of clothing and food products. Why limit the inquiry to shoes? It is true that shoes are going up outrageously in price every day, until the price has become practically prohibitive. In fact in my city the price has risen to such an enormous figure that the people are sorely tiring of the condition, and the mind of the public has become so aggravated that no man can tell what may happen in the next hour.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I will.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman says the people are clamoring that Congress do something.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Certainly. I am sure the gentleman knows that.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state to the House whether the people are clamoring that the President do something?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The people want the Congress to do something. Congress is invested with the power to legislate.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. Can the gentleman suggest any legislation that is needed to authorize the President to proceed against all profiteers and the people who are responsible for the high cost of living?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That embraces a variety of things the discussion of which I can not enter into at the present. I agree with the gentleman who addressed the House just before I rose as to the things that may possibly go to help out the situation; but I am sure that some committee composed of the wise men of this House can formulate some legislation, and that, together with the reports that will come to us from the various bureaus and commissions, will enable us to pass practical legislation that will go to relieve the serious situation that now confronts the American people.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state that while our good friends from New York, during the past few weeks, have been enjoying their vacations—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have not been enjoying any vacation.

Mr. BLANTON. Who have lately come back here in order to be present on the question of the daylight law, I presume, the President of the United States has addressed Congress in the absence of some of our good friends from New York, and the administration has been at work for two weeks nearly on this very question.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The administration is entitled to credit for what it has done. The gentleman is mistaken about the gentleman from New York having enjoyed a vacation. So far as I am concerned, I have worked.

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes.

Mr. TINCHER. Is the gentleman familiar with the report filed in the last week by the Federal Trade Commission concerning the price of shoes?

Mr. DYER. Has the gentleman read the report?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have read the substance.

Mr. TINCHER. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Federal Trade Commission, in June, 1918, made exhaustive reports after extensive hearings upon the subject of the high cost of living, and recommended that the Department of Justice prosecute the five great packers in the United States for profiteering?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I understand that the Department of Justice is working to prosecute and punish the profiteers.

Mr. TINCHER. This report that I am talking about was filed in May, 1918. Is it upon that report that the gentleman understands the Department of Justice is now working?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What the specific foundation is I do not know. I trust that the amendment that has been offered will pass.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with keen interest to the discussion here of the proposed investigation of the cost of clothing, and I have some figures here of what it cost to manufacture an overcoat during the past two years which I desire to put into the RECORD. During the past two years the cost of manufacturing an overcoat has jumped from \$10.85 to \$22.62. The cost of tailoring an overcoat in 1917 was \$3, the cost of tailoring in 1918 was \$3.75. The cost of tailoring up to last Friday was \$8. The cost of trimmings for an overcoat in 1917 was \$2.85; in 1918, \$3.82; in 1919, up to last week, \$7.12. The cost of the cloth in 1917, taking 2½ yards to make an overcoat, was \$5; in 1918, \$10; up to last week, 1919, \$7.50; making a total cost for the overcoat in 1917 of \$10.85, in 1918 of \$17.57, up to last week of 1919, of \$22.62. The itemized account is as follows:

Cost of manufacturing an overcoat.

Cost of making overcoat in 1917	\$3.00
Cost of making overcoat in 1918	3.75
Cost of making overcoat in 1919	8.00

Trimming an overcoat.

1917.	
Satin	\$1.60
Buttons	.25
Canvas	.40
Silesia	.05
Collar canvas	.05
Underyoke	.05
Buckram	.05
Plush pockets	.25
Undercollar	.15
Total	2.85

1918.	
Satin	2.00
Buttons	.40
Canvas	.50
Silesia	.08
Collar canvas	.08
Underyoke	.08
Buckram	.08
Plush pockets	.40
Undercollar	.20
Total	3.82

1919.	
Satin	4.70
Buttons	.70
Canvas	.55
Silesia	.10
Collar canvas	.10
Underyoke	.12
Buckram	.10
Plush pockets	.50
Undercollar	.25
Total	7.12

Cost of cloth.	
1917.	
2½ yards to an overcoat at \$2 per yard.....	\$5.00
1918.	
2½ yards to an overcoat at \$4 per yard.....	10.00
1919.	
2½ yards to an overcoat at \$3 per yard.....	7.50
Net cost of overcoat.	
1917.	
Making.....	\$3.00
Trimming.....	2.85
Cloth.....	5.00
Total.....	10.85
1918.	
Making.....	3.75
Trimming.....	3.82
Cloth.....	10.00
Total.....	17.57
1919.	
Making.....	8.00
Trimming.....	7.12
Cloth.....	7.50
Total.....	22.62

It will be observed from the figures that I have read that the greatest increase has been in the amount paid for labor.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Certainly.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman does not mean that those are the union figures? He does not mean to say that the union scale of tailoring on an overcoat was under \$5 any time in the last 10 years?

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, yes; it has been. I gave the union scale in 1917.

Mr. WINGO. The union scale prior to the war was \$5 minimum for tailoring on an overcoat or a coat.

Mr. SIEGEL. That may be in the gentleman's district.

Mr. WINGO. And these are the union figures that the gentleman is giving?

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes; they are. I will say for the gentleman's information that at a meeting held on Friday night in New York City the wages of these tailors were increased to the extent of \$6 per week, and an agreement was made that there would be a further increase of \$5 on the 1st of December.

Mr. WINGO. I know it was stated publicly since I became a Member of Congress, and I asked a tailor in Washington to verify it at that time. That was before the war. It was stated then that the minimum union scale of wages for tailoring was \$5.

Mr. SIEGEL. I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman who gave him the information—

Mr. WINGO. That was a public statement. I did not believe it, and I asked a tailor in Washington, who told me that it was true.

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, many people in Washington have always been in the habit of asking somebody to pass it out to them from time immemorial.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman inform the House what percentage of profit the retailer has added on to the cost of manufacture in 1919, as compared with the percentage of profit added on to the cost of manufacture in 1917 and 1918?

Mr. SIEGEL. An overcoat manufactured for \$22.62 up to last week will be sold at retail for between \$50 and \$60.

Mr. BARBOUR. Who gets the profit?

Mr. SIEGEL. There are three people getting it.

Mr. BARBOUR. In the neck.

Mr. SIEGEL. Three people are getting the profit.

Mr. BARBOUR. Oh, I thought the gentleman said "we people."

Mr. SIEGEL. I admit that we people are getting it in the neck as a rule.

Mr. WINGO. I understood the gentleman to be giving the cost of hand tailoring.

Mr. SIEGEL. Oh, no; this is the cost of manufacturing.

Mr. WINGO. Oh, that is different.

Mr. BARBOUR. Has the gentleman made any investigation as to the percentage of profit made by the retailers in clothing lines? I assume he made some investigation along the manufacturing line.

Mr. SIEGEL. The gentleman will find that the profit is at least 50 per cent, and in many cases 100 per cent, from the manufacturer through the jobber and retailer to the consumer.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it not a fact that the retailer has added a much higher percentage of profit on the cost of manufacture in 1919 than he did in 1917 and 1918?

Mr. SIEGEL. He has to do it, because he is confronted with a complicated situation. The people demand the latest styles, and if the style of a garment is a few months old it will not be sold unless sold at a big sacrifice. Then he is confronted with the question of overhead charges in whatever place he happens to have his place of business, depending upon locality, and so forth.

Mr. EMERSON. Does not the gentleman think we ought to include clothing and food products in this resolution?

Mr. SIEGEL. Personally, I feel that if an investigation can be made quickly and results obtained quickly they should be included; but I have no particular faith in investigations merely as investigations. Personally, I think that a bill which I offered—some call it a drastic bill—providing that the cost price of each article be stamped on the article from the manufacturer and jobber and wholesaler down to the retailer, if passed, probably will correct the situation more promptly than would a lot of investigations at big expense. I have sufficient faith in the American people to believe that they are always ready and willing to allow every merchant a fair profit.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. Certainly I do.

Mr. ESCH. The bill that the gentleman introduced does not limit the operations to interstate commerce. What authority has Congress got over that subject matter unless it enters into interstate commerce?

Mr. SIEGEL. I assume that if we have authority to tax them in order to get a license, incidentally, too, we have authority to require them to state thereon the price of the article. We have exercised that power when we passed the drug act and the pure-food act.

Mr. EMERSON. I would say I would be in favor of the gentleman's bill if it was before the House; but this happens to be the only one that is before the House.

Mr. SIEGEL. This will only give an investigation, and that investigation will last a year or two. I want results, not more talk.

Mr. EMERSON. We can limit them.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. There is no time set in this resolution, and it will drag along and we will probably be in the same bad situation. However, I trust that the resolution as amended will pass.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I do.

Mr. KING. The gentleman is an authority upon matters of this kind, and I would like to ask him if he does not think it would be a good plan for awhile to open up some of the Army commissaries for the sale of shoes and other articles to the people? I notice the price of blankets has been reduced by Goldstein up here from \$1.50 to \$2 after the sale here by the Government the other day.

Mr. SIEGEL. Yes; and I would like to see the Government commence to sell direct to the consumer every one of the articles in its possession throughout the whole country, and then you will see an immediate reduction in the prices.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEGEL. I do.

Mr. REAVIS. Does the gentleman think this Government can consistently proceed against an individual or a firm for hoarding when we have been hoarding for nine months since the armistice was declared great food supplies, clothing, blankets, shoes, and so forth?

Mr. SIEGEL. I will answer the gentleman by saying that what occurred in the past is forgotten history. What we are confronted with at the present time is this, that the people of this country demand relief, and we have got to give them that relief swiftly. I do not contend for a moment that the Government's policy of a few months ago of meeting large manufacturers of foodstuffs privately and agreeing at that time to withhold those foodstuffs from the markets was an ideal thing for the average American citizen. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIEGEL. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GREEN of Iowa). The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to this resolution, particularly to the matter of freight rates and the basis of the freight rates, which enter into the cost of shoes as well as all the other necessities of life. I will not have time

to do it in the few minutes which I desire to consume at this time, so I ask leave to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, an important element of the cost of shoes and all other necessities of life is the transportation cost. We have got, first, the cost of transporting cattle from the farm to the packing house, or when they are not carried directly from the farm to the packing house, the transporting of the cattle from the ranches where they are grazed to the feeding farms and from thence to the packing house. Then, when the cattle are butchered, we have the transporting of the hides to the tanner, and when the tanner gets through with them, then the transporting of the leather to the shoe manufacturer, and then of the shoes to the jobber and from the jobber to the retailer. So that the cost of transportation affects largely the cost of shoes, as well as of other necessities, three or four times between the beginning of the raw material and the man who actually uses the shoes. No more important question is now before the American people than the settlement of the railroad question, which is now being considered by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, the entire country was greatly shocked last week by the sensational charges made by the representatives of the railroad employees of gigantic frauds perpetrated in the capitalization of our railroads. The charges voiced by Mr. Plumb, attorney for the railway labor organizations, were so sensational and far-reaching as to cause amazement from one end of the Nation to the other.

The charges made against the railroads involve not merely fraudulent capitalization but almost every form of common stealing. It was charged that not only has the capital of railroads been ballooned by false issues of stock and securities, but the railroads have been robbed of their assets through every form of big and little graft.

This is a matter of momentous concern to the people. Upon the capitalization of railroads are the people required to pay a "fair return" through transportation charges. Every dollar of fraudulent addition to railroad assets or debts means that a tax through rates must be levied upon the people to make that dollar good. Every dollar stolen from the railroads is a dollar stolen from the people of the United States.

The charges made against the railroads have the greatest significance, especially at this time, when the railroad owners are seeking to have Congress validate their capitalization and their debts by legislation. They are demanding of Congress a guaranty of an income upon their capital and debts. If Congress yields to their demands, the burden of all the frauds and stealing will be securely placed upon the shoulders of the people. There will be no hope for them to unload it in future. This is the big stake that the railroads are playing for. This is why they have carried on the most expensive propaganda in the history of our Nation, why they have bought newspapers and have poisoned all the springs of public information.

If the charges made by the labor representatives are true, Congress and the country ought to know it. If they are false, the welfare of the railroads themselves demands that they should be exposed. Congress can not legislate intelligently upon the railroad question without fuller knowledge on these subjects. If the charges are true, Congress must legislate having that fact before it. If they are false, we must shape our action accordingly.

For these reasons it is of the highest importance that a thorough investigation of the charges be made at once. The investigation must be made before any action is taken by Congress upon the pending railroad measures. We must either turn back the railroads to their owners without attempting to deal with the railroad question in any permanent way—turn the railroads back as near as may be as we received them—or we must know the facts upon these charges. It will be the greatest blunder in the history of Congress if we attempt to legislate upon the railroad issue without knowledge of the truth of these charges.

Now, I am not disposed to treat these charges lightly. We have been hearing rumors of these frauds for many years. Suspicion of dishonesty in connection with railroad management exists very generally in the minds of the people. Besides this is the fact that representatives of over 2,000,000 railroad employees, comprising some of the most conservative labor organizations in the world, have made the charges. These labor officials assert that the charges are true. They are demanding an investigation of them. Representing more than 2,000,000 citizens of our country, come these charges and this demand for an investigation. More than one-tenth of the entire population of

the United States may be said to be back of these charges. The people back of them are railroad employees, many of whom have an inside knowledge of the facts. Outside of the railroad managers no class of our citizens has so much knowledge of this subject. The charges, therefore, are to be taken with the greatest seriousness. They are worthy of the attention of Congress. We can not afford to do less than give the full investigation which is demanded.

Mr. Speaker, the 4 railway brotherhoods and 10 affiliated railway labor organizations of the American Federation of Labor, who prefer these charges, have for the last 25 years been recognized as the most conservative and responsible labor unions of America. They declare that they are "prepared during the investigation which we invoke to substantiate each and every one of these charges." They charge the fraudulent doubling of the property investment accounts of the railways above their cost of reproduction, new; and that the railway executives are conspiring through banking houses and interlocking directorates and the United States Chamber of Commerce to fasten this fraudulent capitalization upon the public as a legal basis for taxing the transportation of goods. They specify hundreds of millions of stock bonuses representing not one dollar of investment in the public highways on which, nevertheless, the railroads ask the public to pay dividends. They specify millions of acres of lands given by State and Federal Governments to the railroads that go to swell their investment accounts on which returns are demanded; they charge hundreds of millions of excessive earnings above dividend requirements, plowed into the properties and made the basis for rate exactions.

They charge that President Underwood, of the Erie Railroad, states that pay rolls of employees have been enormously padded by the Railroad Administration, and that if this has been done it has been by collusion of railway managers, at the instance of Wall Street, in order to make it appear that Government control is wasteful and extravagant.

They charge that by like collusion immense quantities of railway supplies have been bought beyond present needs and at Government expense under war prices in order that these supplies may be used when the roads go back to private control.

If these charges so responsibly made are true, then there is a barefaced attempt to defraud the American public of billions of dollars at a time when they are staggering under the burden of living costs. It would be a disgrace to Congress if this demand for an orderly and lawful investigation should be denied or smothered in committee. The railway labor organizations declare that the evidence which they will adduce bears directly on legislation involving the possible return of the railroads to the alleged looters and plunderers of the public highways. If, as they say, they have in their hands the evidence of such gigantic plundering and looting, or can point out where it can be obtained, what reasonable objection can be raised to granting an investigation?

Mr. Speaker, we can not properly refuse the lawful requests of labor leaders who seek a constitutional means of allaying the unrest that is rising to the danger point. The moment the millions of men of the labor organizations become convinced that Congress will not heed the reasonable requests of their leaders, we may look out for trouble. The moment the people of the country become convinced that an attempt is being made—mind, I am not charging that such an attempt is being made, but I urge upon this House speedy action—the moment they think they see an attempt to smother or delay investigation into charges of such magnitude and gravity, then forces will be let loose in this Republic that might eventually become ungovernable. The warning of the leaders of the American railway labor movement should not be lightly disregarded. They have been repeatedly uttered, accompanied by these charges. Shall we ignore them now?

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I was going to express surprise that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], coming from a great industrial center, as he does, from Birmingham, should state that the people of this country were shocked by these charges. Charges similar to these have been made in this country for the last 5 or 10 years, and there is not anything new about them. I was going to state that the Interstate Commerce Commission has been investigating that question for five years.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing vague rumors of these matters for years. They have been charged in newspapers and elsewhere, but nobody heretofore has come forward and said, "I make that charge; I have the proofs; I demand an investigation; I offer to prove what I say." For the first time in the history of this question in this country have we a responsible body of men coming forward and saying, "We stand ready to prove the truth of these charges."

Meanwhile the representatives of the employees continue to reiterate their far-reaching charges. Only to-day their attorney and spokesman, Mr. Plumb, wrote the chairman of the committee a letter formally repeating the charges and demanding an investigation of them. I extend this letter in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. JOHN J. ESCH,

Chairman Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 18, 1919.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention is called to a report in the Washington Post to the effect that you intend to confer with officials of the Interstate Commerce Commission in order to learn whether it will be practicable for that body to conduct the investigation of railroad financing which I have requested on behalf of the organized railway employees of America.

May I say, with reference to this report and with reference to your questions of like purport put to me when I preferred the charges of the railway brotherhoods and their 10 affiliated railway labor organizations of the American Federation of Labor, that I fear you have missed the intent which actuated the preferment of those charges at this time. The investigation should be made and reported upon before Congress acts.

Congress needs enlightenment. If a political conspiracy exists, as responsibly charged by labor organizations generally acknowledged to be the most conservative in America, to seek validation by Congress of billions of fictitious railroad securities, prompt investigation is needed by a committee of the House or Senate, or preferably by a joint committee of both Houses, of evidence which we are prepared to make available. Congress has now the railroad problem before it. Neither Congress nor the American people can pass intelligently upon this problem without the information which we have and are prepared to submit.

Now, if Congress wishes to designate the Interstate Commerce Commission as the instrument of the investigation demanded, well and good. But it should be expressly provided that the investigation be prompt, in order that the report of the commission upon the catalogue of charges may be placed before Congress and the public before the enactment of any measure looking to the restoration of the railroads to hands which we denounce as unclean.

With all deference to you and to the great committee of the House on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which you are the honored chairman, permit me to reiterate these charges, which have been made with the utmost deliberation and care, with a full sense of their gravity, and sustained by the weighty and conservative forces of American labor unions with the offer at once to substantiate each and every of them:

We charge that the railroads of the United States seek of Congress legalization of a fraudulent property investment account, fraudulent by billions of dollars and built up in violation of the constitutions of the separate States and of the United States. On the basis of these fraudulent billions they seek to fasten, through act of Congress, a charge upon the cost of living of the entire Nation by exacting a return of at least 6 per cent from excessive transportation rates.

We charge that the men who are pushing this conspiracy through the United States Chamber of Commerce and other bodies are controlled in whole or in part by the Morgan interests, the Rockefeller interests, and the Gould interests. Through the interlocking directorates of banks and trust companies these three financial groups control the 254,000 miles of railway of the United States. We will submit complete charts showing these interlocking directorates and financial interests in their relation to the railroads.

We charge that the five railway valuations first completed and published by the Interstate Commerce Commission show the aggregate property investment accounts of the railways named therein to be double their estimated actual cost of reproduction, new. We charge that, so far as the valuation division of the Interstate Commerce Commission has valued railroads, after nearly completing its survey of the entire transportation area of the United States, this ratio of double the estimated actual cost of reconstruction, new, holds constant with respect to the aggregate property investment account as submitted by the railroads. It is upon this fraudulent investment account which the United States Chamber of Commerce and the financial interests behind it ask Congress to compel the American people to pay over 6 per cent in yearly returns.

We charge that wherever the Valuation Division of the Interstate Commerce Commission has found the investment account, as stated by the carrier, equal to its estimated cost of reproduction, new, it is due to surplus and excessive earnings after ample dividends have been declared to stockholders and bondholders, and that these excessive earnings extorted from the public have been ploughed into the property and made the basis for corresponding and unwarranted transportation charges.

We demand investigation of the statement made by President Underwood, of the Erie Railroad—and, since these charges were made, reaffirmed by him—that the railroad employment pay rolls have been padded under Government control in order to build a political machine. We charge that if it is found that the pay rolls have been so padded, the railway managers have padded them to make the expense account under Government control seem extravagant and wasteful.

We charge that when the Government took control it found the railroads systematically starved in the interest of the financial groups named. It found their roadbeds and rolling stock depleted. It spent hundreds of millions of dollars to put them in condition. We charge that managers under the control of these financial groups have diverted vast sums of the Government's money for upkeep and supplies, not only for present needs, but anticipating the long future after the railroads should be returned to their private looters and despoilers. They have piled up these supplies for a long period of operation ahead, paid for out of the people's money at exorbitant war prices.

We charge that the Interstate Commerce Commission was six years ago directed by Congress, in the provisions of the valuation act, to find and report upon the value of all aids, gifts, and grants made to railway corporations, the value of those grants at the time made, and the value of the portions of the grants still in the possession of the carriers at the time of valuation. This work has not been done.

We charge that an area of land larger than the combined areas of the New England States, New York, Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois has been given by the United States and by State governments to the railroads without compensation

and in order to help them build the Nation's highways. We charge that of these grants, making allowance for the 115,000,000 acres patented and the 35,000,000 acres forfeited prior to June 30, 1910, the greater part of over 40,000,000 acres remains available. The values of these grants have been sequestered by railway promoters or capitalized as part of the book values of the railway properties on which the railroad corporations directed by the financial groups named herein now ask Congress to permit them to extort fraudulent returns from the public.

We charge that the property investment accounts of the railroads have been fraudulently doubled above their estimated cost of reproduction, new, by such means as these: The \$250,000,000 in bonuses given away to their stockholders from 1900 to 1910 by the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad; by the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul; the Chicago & North Western; the Great Northern; the Illinois Central; and the Southern Pacific. On this \$250,000,000 of excess capital in 1913 alone the public was compelled to pay more than \$11,000,000. The public had to pay in that year \$4,317,000 on stock fraudulently issued by eight eastern railroads during 1900 to 1910 for \$101,000,000 less than the market value. During the same period 18 representative railroads running through all parts of the country gave away stock bonuses aggregating \$450,000,000. On these the public has had to pay—now pays.

We wish gravely and responsibly to point out that these gigantic frauds, of which we have given only instances, now work to overburden the people with charges on their cost of living.

We wish to show that the people have given gifts to the railroads, and that the railroads are taxing them upon those gifts for the sake of their private owners. We wish to show that they have perpetrated fraud after fraud upon the public, looted the vast railroad systems of the Nation, and that they now bring the record of their loot and plunder to Congress, saying: "Make it lawful and let us exact a toll of 6 per cent upon these billions that we have filched. That will restore our credit."

They ask further that the livelihood of over 2,000,000 railway employees and their families shall be placed again at their tender mercies. Lawless and irresponsible, they accuse the responsible leaders of the American labor movement of attempting to foment revolution. Instead, we show that we are law-abiding. We appeal to the people, to Congress, and the courts. We ask that the constitution of the States and of the United States be vindicated. We ask for an immediate and peaceable hearing of our charges, responsibly made.

You will recall the earnest warning uttered to your committee by Mr. Garretson, in which he said that it is largely within the power of Congress to allay the unrest which is taxing to the utmost the energies of the labor leaders to restrain. In this law-abiding course we ask your aid. We ask that our charges be respected and heeded, that this hearing be had, that the investigation prayed for be made, and that a report upon the findings be laid before Congress before it acts to restore the veins and arteries of the Nation to the private financial groups that have drained them of their life-giving properties.

Very sincerely, yours,

GLENN E. PLUMB,

Counsel for the Organized Railway Employees of America.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution asking for an investigation of these charges. It has been referred to the Committee on Rules. The resolution provides for the appointment of an investigating committee. I think that is the way to get at this matter. It will not answer to refer it to the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have been dealing with various aspects of this question and have some facts, it is true, but they have not had this identical question put upon them, decision has not been asked of them, and many of its aspects are beyond the scope of the investigation that they could carry on. The commission is loaded down with work; it is not possible for them to make promptly an investigation, as it ought to be made. The work should be carried forward by a committee of the House, as it seems to me. The full facts should be brought out before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reports on the measures proposed by the railroads, which would validate their securities and make good the capitalization and debts of these great corporations. We ought to know the true facts before it is put out of the power of the people to ever get relief from such a situation. This is not an issue in which merely the railroad companies and the employees are concerned; it concerns the whole people of the United States. They should not be required during all the years of the future to pay tribute to the railroads upon a fictitious capitalization.

Mr. EMERSON. This being the only resolution before the House to take up this matter, does not the gentleman think we should pass this and include in it food and clothing, as well as shoes?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If the gentleman refers to the particular resolution before the House now, I think it should be adopted. But I say to the gentleman that we ought also to go into the question of transportation and the capitalization of the railroads, which will form the basis of freight and passenger charges in future. That question will remain with us long after we get through with the present acute stage of the cost of living.

Mr. EMERSON. I suggest to the gentleman that could be done in conjunction with the legislation as to the high cost of living.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Not at all. To tack on the railroad investigation to the investigation of shoe prices will simply load the latter down, delay action which should be immediate, and perhaps in the end defeat the very purpose we are trying to accomplish.

For information of the House I attach my resolution calling for an investigation of the charges made by the representatives of the railroad employees, House resolution 243:

House resolution 243.

Whereas sensational charges have been made before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by the responsible representatives of 2,200,000 railroad employees, that the railroads of the United States are now seeking to validate billions of fraudulent capitalization, thereby burdening the American people in their cost of living with unjust and oppressive charges for transportation; and Whereas if this gigantic fraud has been perpetrated the American people are entitled to know it and the full extent thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, directed and empowered to appoint a committee of six Representatives in Congress, which committee shall be charged with the duty to investigate and ascertain and report upon the truth of said charges, to wit:

1. Whether it is true, as charged, that the railroads have fraudulently issued vast sums in securities in excess of the consideration paid therefor, and, if so, the extent of such usurpation.

2. Whether it is true, as charged, that such railroads have expended on their properties out of excess earnings large amounts received by them as payment for such service, and, if so, to what extent and amount, and how far such expenditures are now represented in their investment accounts.

3. Whether it is true, as charged, that gifts, grants, aids, and donations of great value made to said corporations in aid of the construction of their railroads have been appropriated to the private benefit of promoters or capitalized against the public in property investment accounts, and, if so, to what extent.

4. Whether it is true, as charged, that the pay rolls of the railroads while under Government control have been padded for political purposes, and, if so, on whose responsibility such expenditures have been made and the extent thereof.

5. Whether it is true, as charged, that while under Government control the managers of the railroads have spent large and unnecessary sums for the maintenance and renewals of their properties, and for overcoming past depreciation, and, if so, to what extent, and on whom rests the responsibility therefor.

Sec. 2. That for the purpose of said inquiry the said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers, administer oaths and affirmations, take testimony, to sit during the sessions of the House or during any recess of the House, and may hold its sessions at such places as the committee may determine. Said committee shall have the right at any time to report to the House in one or more reports the result of its inquiries, with such recommendations as it may deem advisable. The Speaker is hereby empowered to issue subpoenas upon the request of the chairman of said committee at any time, and during any recess of the House throughout the inquiry of the committee, and the Sergeant at Arms is hereby empowered and directed to serve all subpoenas and other process transmitted to him by said committee. Said committee is hereby authorized to employ such attorneys, counsel, auditors, statisticians, investigators, clerks, and other agents as it may deem fit for the purposes of such investigation.

Sec. 3. That the sum of \$100,000 is hereby appropriated to carry out the provisions of this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is recognized.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I will occupy but very little time, and I wish to say to the House that for Congress to investigate the high cost of living and to reduce the high cost of living quickly is a very difficult problem, one not so easy as it may appear to be on the surface. In the first place, prices are always high when there is a shortage of supply. When the demand is greater than the supply you may look for high prices.

I am old enough to remember the Civil War. And after that war the prices were very high for some years. I can remember that flour sold at \$30 a barrel in the United States and sugar at 50 cents a pound. It is not quite that high now. Meat is selling at a very high price.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, the circulating medium in this country at that time was only about 40 or 50 or 60 cents on the dollar, was it not?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; that is right—paper money, greenbacks, worth about 50 cents on the dollar.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And every dollar in the United States is a dollar now.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in reply to the gentleman from Missouri that there is not a dollar in the United States that is worth a hundred cents on the dollar.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. When?

Mr. MADDEN. Now.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is it worth?

Mr. MADDEN. About 48 cents. That is the purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is no such case as it was after the Civil War.

Mr. MADDEN. If the gentleman will permit me, of course we have already expanded the currency about \$13,000,000,000 by making loans to people who had to buy Government bonds and who had not any money otherwise with which to buy them.

The banks and the Government encouraged these people to buy. More than 90 per cent of the \$3,000,000 people who bought

bonds did not have a dollar with which to pay. The banks had to loan to them. The banks did not have the money to loan them. They had to take these bonds and put them up as collateral security with their own notes and get them rediscounted by the Federal reserve banks. The Federal reserve banks did not have any money to loan, and they had to issue Federal reserve note currency—\$13,000,000,000 of expansion.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman does not mean to say that there has been issued \$13,000,000,000 of Federal reserve notes?

Mr. MADDEN. I mean there has been that expansion by loans.

Mr. WINGO. You mean of credits?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; of credits. It has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar to-day to 48 cents, notwithstanding what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] says.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to use up the time of the gentleman from Michigan, but—

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman can get all the time he wants. Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is clearly off his box.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The proposition that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] was talking about was paper money.

Mr. MADDEN. This is paper money.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. After the Civil War a dollar of paper money was worth somewhere from 40 cents to 60 cents. Now a paper dollar is worth just as much as the gold dollar.

Mr. MADDEN. We had no gold or silver in circulation at that time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gold dollar is not the standard now, what is it?

Mr. MADDEN. The gold dollar is the standard, but it is not circulating. It is the Federal reserve notes that are in circulation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Federal reserve note is just as good as the dollar. If you think it is not, go down and try it. The truth about the whole thing is that the whole world is on a paper basis.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; the whole world is on a paper basis, and the gentleman is mistaken when he says that we are on a better basis than any other country in the world.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never said a word to that effect.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentlemen will permit me, I will say that there is a shortage of supply in this country at the present time. I have a statement here issued by the Department of Commerce a few days ago, to which I wish to call the attention of gentlemen, as to the exports of food supply. In the first place let me say that for four and one-half years the whole world has been engaged in destroying human life and property, and not producing food articles or anything else of use, producing nothing but distress and misery, and there is a shortage of supply all over the world, and a great demand for these articles right now. But in the last 12 months ending with June we exported, in round numbers, \$1,000,000,000 worth of breadstuffs and nearly \$1,250,000,000 worth of meat. Had we been able to keep that supply at home, our people would now have plenty to supply all demands at home. But there is a shortage at home and abroad, which adds very much to the cost of living all over the world.

But to talk about Congress right now quickly reducing the cost of living without reducing the cost of production is demagoguery. It does not mean anything else. [Applause.] It can not be done. How can we increase the cost of production and at the same time lower the cost of the things produced by that man's labor? It is silly to talk about it. Gentlemen, the cost of production the world over is inflated—on the crest of the wave at the present time. Everything that enters into the cost of production is high, and labor is at least 90 per cent of the cost of the production of anything that we produce, either upon the farm or in the factory. If we increase men's pay can we at the same time lower the cost of living? No sensible, sane business man will make that statement and mean what he says.

I notice that this resolution strikes out sugar. Let me say to the gentlemen of the House that the Food Administration at about the beginning of this year, in January, entered into an agreement with Cuban sugar producers to the effect that our Government would purchase all the sugar produced for export by Cuba. I have a copy of that contract. An upset price was set forth in that contract at which our Government would take that sugar f. o. b. Habana or f. o. b. New York, duty paid. In addition to that the Food Administration entered into a contract with the sugar refiners of this country to the effect that the refiners would take that sugar from the Government of the United States, through the Food Administration, at a certain price, and the Food Administration, under powers vested in them, fixed the

wholesale price not only of that sugar but sugar produced in this country from beets and cane at \$8.65 per 100 pounds.

That is the law now in force and enforceable by the Food Administration. The price has been fixed at \$10 per ton for sugar beets to the beet-sugar manufacturers of this country, and they are paying that price for the farmer's crop to-day for all the beets produced in this country, and to the manufacturers the price of sugar was fixed by the Food Administration at \$8.65 per 100 pounds.

The thing to investigate is what are the retailers selling that sugar for, and what are their profits, and whether it is an unreasonable profit. The manufacturer is completely bound by these contracts and under the supervision of the Food Administration, and therefore it was wise to strike sugar from this resolution, because nothing can be done or should be done there, because the Government now controls the manufacturer's price absolutely.

If you will take into consideration these questions, the cost of production and the amount of those articles that we are exporting to other parts of the world, you will find that no great bugaboo is going to be found in this investigation, though some men may think there will be.

It is true, undoubtedly, that profiteers have gone beyond that which is reasonable and are exacting from the people more profits than they should, but in every instance it will be found that the cost of production is high. I have just returned from my home State, Michigan, and while there I made inquiry and found that farm labor is receiving board and washing and \$60 a month. Do you believe that the farmer can produce food cheaply and sell it at a low price when it is costing him a high price to produce it? No; if there is profiteering, it is in the cold storages and in the high prices exacted by the wholesalers, middlemen, and retailers, in my opinion. I do not believe the farmers to-day are getting any more than a fair price for their farm products. Investigation might show it; but let us go at this matter sanely. Let men be sensible. Let them be reasonable. Let them investigate and find where the trouble is and there remedy the trouble. I was talking to a barber the other day. He said that we ought to lower the cost of living. When I asked him if he thought it could be done without lowering the cost of production, he said it could. I said, "My friend, you now are working how many hours a day?" He said, "Ten hours." "You are shaving men at 20 cents and cutting hair for 40 cents?" He replied, "Yes." I asked him, "Can you reduce your working hours to six hours a day and reduce the price you get for shaving to 10 or 15 cents and increase your income? If so, tell me how you are going to do it." He said he did not think it was a fair illustration. I said, "Sir, you know more about your own business than you know about anybody else's business. How can you shorten your hours of labor and lower the price of your product and increase your income at the same time?" Oh, gentlemen, it is silly to talk about lowering the cost of living without first lowering the cost of production.

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. REAVIS. The high cost of living is merely the result of several contributing causes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Many contributing causes.

Mr. REAVIS. And the only way to reduce it is to reduce the cause.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; absolutely.

Mr. REAVIS. One contributing cause is the cost of production.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. We understand from the press that the President is considering the raising of the wages of railroad labor to reduce the high cost of living. Do you know how you can decrease the result by increasing the cause which produces that result?

Mr. FORDNEY. I said a few moments ago that any man who advocated such a thing was a demagogue, and I have nothing to take back on that subject.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The United Fruit Co., which has headquarters in Boston, New York, and other big cities, according to its own statement is making 40 per cent; that is, \$40 on every \$100 of capital invested. Its profits have been so huge in the last few years that it has paid off millions of dollars of bonded indebtedness which would not ordinarily expire for years. In fact, the other day that company called in bonds because its profits were so huge. That company is now charging from \$5.75 to \$6.50 for bananas that before the war were sold for from \$1.75 to \$3 per hundred. It was a common thing in the big

cities of the country to find bananas, which are a food as well as a fruit, selling for from 15 to 20 cents a dozen, and now they are 40 to 50 cents a dozen. This company practically controls this particular trade, and I want to ask the gentleman, in all fairness, if he does not think that 40 per cent profit in these times is an unconscionable profit?

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that under existing law the administration has power under war legislation to regulate those things.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope that is so.

Mr. FORDNEY. We passed these laws and they remain upon our statute books until we receive notice from the President that peace has been declared between our Government and the Government of Germany. No such notice has been given by our President. Therefore this power rests in the administration.

What is the Department of Justice doing to correct the very thing that the gentleman is complaining about? The power rests there. It is not necessary for Congress to go any further than it has gone in the way of giving the Government greater power, because we have given them all the power they need, all that we can give them. Why are they not correcting these injustices now?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to bring out the point that the gentleman was developing here, that there are some big interests in the country to-day—and I name the United Fruit Co. as one—that are getting unconscionable profits from the people. If the Department of Justice has the power and has not exercised it, then the responsibility rests with that department; it does not make any difference what administration it is.

Mr. FORDNEY. If they have not the power under existing laws, which are war measures, they should come to Congress and ask for that power.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I agree to that.

Mr. FORDNEY. Because under such circumstances, if that corporation or any other great corporation or set of individuals in the country is exacting too much profit from the people, that condition ought to be corrected, and the power rests in the administration, or it can be given by the Congress of the United States, if asked for.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DENISON. I understand the resolution has been read and is now being read for amendment.

The SPEAKER. Amendments are in order.

Mr. DENISON. When do we vote upon these various amendments that have been offered?

The SPEAKER. At any time when debate is finished.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. In just a moment. How much time is there? Is the time unlimited?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Under what rule are we proceeding? Who has charge of the time, and how much time is there?

The SPEAKER. There is no limit to the time. We are proceeding under the general rules of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And every man who gets recognition is entitled to an hour?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has already spoken once. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, when the Speaker was out of the chair a moment ago, temporarily, I asked the then occupant of the chair for recognition when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] had finished. The then occupant of the chair said that he would recognize me. Of course, if the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] wants to speak, I shall gladly give way to him, but I would like to be recognized after that.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wyoming prefer to speak now or after the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MONDELL. That depends upon how long the gentleman from New York intends to occupy the floor.

Mr. CALDWELL. For only a few moments.

Mr. MONDELL. I merely want to move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to carry out the agreement made by the former occupant of the chair.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, I do not want to unduly limit debate, but I think we ought to get through some time with this discussion.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will not take more than 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I would like to have 10 minutes. I do not think I will take more than five.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield the gentleman five minutes, and if he needs more I shall yield more.

[Mr. CALDWELL addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE].

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced at a time when it was thought the House was going to take a recess, and so it was framed that it would have the Federal Trade Commission make a report on one commodity by the time we returned from the proposed recess. Other items were included, and the resolution was framed as to them so that the report might be made at a subsequent time. After the resolution was referred to the committee, in consultation with some members of the committee, it was thought that in order to get quick action it would be better to confine it to one commodity, and that one was shoes, the first one mentioned in the resolution. That suggestion was acceptable to me, although I would like to have an investigation of all of these matters. But the prime purpose of the resolution is to secure promptly for Congress the facts in the case, and if it is to be of any benefit at all, either to Congress or the country, those facts must be ascertained promptly, so that if legislation is needed we can legislate; and if legislation can not reach the evils, then, at least, let the country know that Congress is helpless or that nothing can be done in the way of legislation to correct the situation.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IGOE. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. If a preference is to be given to any commodity that is to be investigated right now does not the gentleman think food should be given that preference?

Mr. IGOE. My personal preference would be food. But let me say to the gentleman by taking the whole subject of food it would take a long time to reach that. What item of food would you have them undertake to investigate?

Mr. EMERSON. The same principle that increases the cost of potatoes, apples, meats, cheese, and eggs increases the cost of other articles. Is not that true? Is it not a matter of principle? All foods are up, and the same reason that would make meat high would make cheese and eggs high.

Mr. IGOE. Not necessarily. If there are business practices that can be reached by law we can reach them through this particular item. Now, let me say to the gentleman and the House that when the Federal Trade Commission subsequently made this report on shoes I went to the Trade Commission, after it was impossible to get this resolution immediately considered by the House, and discussed the report made. I have not seen the full report but the summary indicates that it has not been brought down fully to cover the last two years, the period I think it is essential to cover not only on shoes but these other commodities, and I was told that the commission has been ordered to investigate a number of things by the Senate, including agricultural implements and a half dozen other things, and that with the money now appropriated by Congress it would take possibly two years, with the small force that they have, to complete those investigations; that this investigation, bringing it down to date, would take probably five or six months, unless an additional appropriation was made by Congress, which would enable them to go at it quickly. Now, the Federal Trade Commission has asked for additional funds, and I suppose the Congress will be reasonable with them and give them a reasonable additional appropriation. But if this House ordered this investigation, with the facts already in hand regarding the manufacture of shoes, regarding the labor cost, and with a force which can be quickly put to work upon it, I see no reason why this report can not be back within five or six weeks, and then the country will know the facts, not as they existed a year and a half or two years ago, but they will know the facts as of to-day. And if Congress can legislate, if there are new laws that can be passed, then let us get to work, and I believe that the great benefit will be not only in regard to the price of shoes, but in regard to everything else, as the publicity that is given to the facts will in a way correct the other evils that now exist.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IGOE. I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman from Missouri think that the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Lever Act are sufficient to handle the situation that everyone is complaining about?

Mr. IGOE. I do not; and I will tell you why—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. IGOE. I am not a political economist, and I am not prepared to give to the House all the reasons for high prices. I have heard about the inflation of the currency, and it is true that has something to do with it as far as I am able to figure. There is also a world's shortage of production; that is true. There is profiteering; that is true. But under the Sherman law you must prove combinations; you must prove restraints of trade, and where you have a shortage of production and a great demand they do not have to enter into combinations. They can exact almost any price until they reach that price where the man who needs an article has not the means whereby to purchase it. I have a resolution pending, I will say to the gentleman, which seeks to have this House, through the Ways and Means Committee, find out if it is true, as I believe it is, that the taxes that we have levied are being passed on. I have heard of instances, for example, where landlords have had to pay \$10,000 additional taxes under our war-tax laws and which they paid on last year's income; but this year they passed them on to the man who pays the rent. I would like to see the revenue act amended so as to catch these people who pass these heavy taxes on down the line. The salaried man and wage earner can not pass on their taxes, and I am afraid the other people are passing their tax burdens on to the wage earners and salaried people by raising prices.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. IGOE. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where millions of dozens of eggs are held in cold storage and large quantities of meats and other foods and leather are piled up in warehouses to the value of millions of dollars, is that not in restraint of trade?

Mr. IGOE. No. You can—

Mr. KNUTSON. Under what authority are they proceeding against the so-called hoarders?

Mr. IGOE. Under the Lever Act.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why did not they proceed a year ago?

Mr. IGOE. I presume then they were then regulating it by the system of licenses. But the cry went up all over after the armistice was signed, and especially, I think, from the gentlemen on the Republican side, that the Government ought to let business alone, should let it be free. Now they are free and are going ahead and raising the prices all over.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. IGOE. I hope they will confine this resolution to one thing that we can get a report quickly on, and if the facts justify legislation let us legislate. At least, let the country know what the facts are. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation for the work of the Federal Trade Commission is a lump sum in addition to that appropriated for the salaries of the commissioners, and amounts to \$1,000,000 for the year. Only about \$100,000 of that has been expended for the month of July. The Federal Trade Commission has already commenced work to investigate with regard to the matters of the high cost of living, and that investigation is confined not only to shoes but also embraces the other necessities of life. But I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this resolution is not worth the paper it is written on. It provides:

That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby directed to inquire into the increase in the price of shoes, to ascertain the cause and necessity for the increase; to ascertain the manufacturers' cost price and selling price and the retailers' cost price and selling price for the years 1918 and 1919, and report to the House at the earliest convenient date the result of the investigation.

It will be noted that this resolution is a House resolution. When passed it is not an act of Congress. Now, what does the Federal Trade Commission law provide for in regard to in-

vestigations required by either House? Section 6 provides that the commission shall have power to investigate; that on the direction of the President or either House of Congress to investigate and report facts relating to any alleged violation of the antitrust act of any corporation the act gives the commission power to investigate on its own motion. Those powers are broad.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. IGOE. If the commission may of its own motion make an investigation, it can make this?

Mr. GOOD. It can of its own motion, and it is doing it of its own motion. It is making an investigation on its own motion broader than here proposed and including the requirements of the resolution.

Mr. IGOE. If it may do it of its own motion, can it not do it when the House requests it?

Mr. GOOD. When the House requests information, it can only furnish information if the information desired is of the facts concerning an alleged violation of antitrust laws by any corporation.

Mr. IGOE. I think the gentleman does not mean to say—

Mr. GOOD. That is the law, and the commission has no authority to expend a single dollar to make any investigation under that law which is requested by the President or by either branch of Congress unless the resolution comes within the express provision of that act.

Now, the President has additional power. During the war we gave the President very unusual power; and not under this Federal Trade Commission act, but under the act that gave the President those unusual war powers he has requested the Federal Trade Commission to make the investigation as to the high cost of living.

But I say to the gentleman from Missouri that if he will read the law that is upon the statute books he will find that neither House of Congress can expect the Federal Trade Commission to respond to a resolution, and, what is more the fact, ought not to have the power without the consent of the other House to permit or to require the expenditure of maybe millions of dollars simply by passing a resolution through one branch of Congress. Broad investigation should be made only when Congress requests it. The only power that Congress gave the Federal Trade Commission to investigate under such resolutions of either House was the alleged violation of the antitrust law by any corporation. It did not even give the Federal Trade Commission the power to investigate, on the request of one House alone, where an individual or a copartnership was violating the antitrust law; and even if that kind of an investigation were ordered, if a resolution requiring it is passed by the House or the Senate, it would not confer upon the Federal Trade Commission the power to make an investigation unless the commission does have the power to make such investigation on its own initiative and is exercising it.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Just for a question.

Mr. IGOE. Do I understand the gentleman to say that while the commission itself may spend millions of dollars in doing a thing, the House can not authorize it to do the same thing?

Mr. GOOD. They have to get an appropriation, which requires the joint action of both Houses. I have read the law. The gentleman is a good lawyer, and—

Mr. IGOE. I have read the law, too—

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman is a good lawyer, and if he will read that provision he will come to the same conclusion that I have arrived at and that anyone else will arrive at, that when the law provides what investigation the commission can make upon the request of the President or either branch of Congress it can not go beyond that.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Is not the Federal Trade Commission making an investigation in response to a Senate resolution alone?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; they are making some investigation, and they are having a good deal of trouble with regard to that provision of the law, and they may have trouble later on if they violate the law in this regard.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. GOOD. There is no use, it seems to me, for the legislative branch of the Government to attempt to do very much at this time in the way of reducing the high cost of living. I did not realize that there was any possible power we could give the

President that we had not given by legislation. Gentlemen have stated several very good reasons why living is high. Another reason will be found in our exports. We are exporting as we never exported before. Take boots and shoes. For the month of June, 1914, we exported only a little over \$1,000,000 worth, and for the month of June of this present year we exported \$8,000,000 worth. Take leather and skins. In June, 1914, we exported \$3,400,000 worth, but in the last month of June we exported almost \$32,000,000 worth. Take breadstuffs. In the month of June, 1914, we exported \$14,000,000 worth of breadstuffs, and in June, 1919, we exported \$118,000,000 worth of breadstuffs. Take meat and dairy products. For the year 1914 we exported \$146,000,000 worth in round numbers, and in the year ended June 30, 1919, we exported \$1,167,000,000 worth.

And what is more, out of the Treasury of the United States we are furnishing the money to buy our own products to send to Europe. And when you have the United States bidding against itself for all the necessities of life you are going to have high prices, irrespective of the laws that we might pass. We furnish the produce and the money to buy it with. Many of these countries are bankrupt and will never repay, so why should they worry so long as we stint ourselves to furnish both produce and the money with which to buy it. Europe does not care what it costs, so long as we furnish both produce and the money that pays for it. If we are honestly working to reduce the high cost of living, if we want to bring down the cost of shoes to the wearers of shoes in America, all that it is necessary to do is for the Secretary of the Treasury to stop loaning money and for the President to put an embargo upon shoes and leather temporarily. If you want to put down the price of meat and meat products for America, all the President has to do is to put an embargo upon meats and meat products for a short time, and you will see the stores of these products go upon the market at such a rate that the price of these things will be forced down here.

But as long as we are engaged upon this plan of feeding the world and clothing the world and furnishing all the money to the outside world with which to buy the necessities, high prices will continue. I realize that we are living in an altruistic age. We are to police the world; we are to perform the mandates because we are best able; we are to feed the world because we are peaceable and industrious; we are to furnish the money because our people will lend their credit; so now we are just getting a little taste of the cost of internationalism. It may be only a forerunner of what will follow. We have advanced almost a billion dollars since the 1st of March to these countries to buy this product, and they do not care what price is paid for it as long as we furnish the materials and furnish the money with which to buy it. How can you prevent high prices under such conditions? I doubt if investigation will reduce them.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Would the gentleman be in favor of putting an embargo upon meats and shoes at this time?

Mr. GOOD. I would, temporarily.

Mr. GARNER. Would the gentleman be in favor of putting an embargo on the exportation of corn and wheat and cotton?

Mr. GOOD. I would, temporarily, and upon cotton and cotton goods if necessary to reduce the price.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman's position, then, is that we do not need any additional legislation, such as was suggested by the President?

Mr. GOOD. There may be something in the President's suggestion with regard to a penalty, with regard to one of the provisions of the food-control act. I have not investigated that.

Mr. GARNER. That is the only suggestion that the President made that meets the gentleman's approval?

Mr. GOOD. That is about the only suggestion that the President made that will get anywhere, and that will not get very far, because no other provision of the law has been enforced, and the other provisions carry penalties, and I think it is now admitted that the President was in error in his discussion as to penalties. That law has been on the statute books for 24 months, and only on Saturday last did the Attorney General, under flaming headlines, announce that the first violator of that law had been fined. No; I want to see penalties placed on that provision of the law if they are not there. I want to give the Attorney General all the power needed to put the violators of the law into the penitentiary, where they belong. [Applause.] But I want the Attorney General to enforce the law and to enforce the penalties which are now in the law, and which he admits are in the law, and which have not been enforced. [Applause.] That will do something. But if you want to reduce living costs let the President act. He has the power. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the entire question of the high cost of living, in my opinion, can be divided into two concrete propositions. We must approach the discussion of it, it strikes me, from the standpoint, first, that we have to-day in America more money than any people ever had in all the annals of time. The whole world has for the last four or five years been engaged in the destruction of property, but in this entire conflict there has not been one dollar destroyed. Property has been destroyed, lives have been lost, but the dollar has not been destroyed. Whenever money is plentiful commodities go up, and whenever money is scarce commodities go down. That has always been so and always will be so. I think the most striking piece of philosophy that I have heard on this question came to me not long since from the lips of my yardman. When I was leaving I told him good-by and gave him a dollar, and I said to him jokingly, "Now, Garrett, don't spend that in riotous living." He said, "Boss, there ain't nothin' cheap now but a dollar." And he was right. There is nothing in the world to-day that is cheap except the dollar. We here in America are trying, with the products of field and farm and factory, to feed a world that is starving and to clothe the nations that are naked. There is no doubt in the world, gentlemen, that the only people on earth who have enough to eat and enough to wear to-day are on this side of the Atlantic. People talk about a return to normal times. They forget that the entire human race has had high fever for between four and five years, suffering from the fever of war. Now war has ceased to be, and it is just as unreasonable to expect conditions to become normal at once as it would be unreasonable to expect a man who has had typhoid fever for seven weeks to get up and go to work the minute the doctor says that he no longer has fever. The patient has to go through the convalescent period, and the world must also go through a convalescent period. Prices are high for one reason because money is plentiful. The gentleman who has just preceded me on this floor [Mr. GOOD] made some remarks about an embargo. I agree with him fully that, perchance, a prohibition against our trading with the world might result in some decline of prices here in America; but at what a cost!

The cost staggers the human imagination, and I do not believe that any man, either in this Chamber or out of it, would advocate the remedy proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD]. [Applause.] I can not conceive it. The effect of it would be too horrible. Therefore my first contention is that the high price of commodities to-day is directly traceable in large part to the tremendous volume of money that we have in America. But then there is another side of the question. When you want to find out why the individual consumer is paying a price you want to investigate whether that price is a fair price in relation to what the producer gets. I think to-day it is manifest that a mere statement of the prices themselves carries with it the irresistible conclusion that the consumer in practically every instance is paying more than he should pay, considering what the producer gets. Take sugar for instance. Down in my State we raise a great deal of sugar. Now, the price that a man gets for his sugar is fixed by law. It is well that that fact should be known, so that you gentlemen, when you go to the grocery store, when the housewife from Maine to California and from Minnesota to Florida buys sugar, she may know whether the price quoted to her is fair. We in Louisiana get \$8.82 per hundred pounds for granulated table sugar. That is what the manufacturer gets for it. Therefore it is an easy matter to add the freight rate to that cost and to add a legitimate percentage to that cost, and then for the individuals to determine whether or not he is paying more than he should pay for his sugar.

Take the question of cotton. We raise a great deal of cotton in my country—

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. EMERSON. When I was home my grocer would sell me only 5 pounds of sugar at a time, and at another time only 2 pounds.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. He said they were sending it abroad and getting more money for it. I think we should keep enough sugar at home to supply our own needs.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. There is no reason to-day why any grocer in this city or in any other city should not sell you 10 pounds of sugar just as quickly as he will sell you 1 pound,

unless the local market is dominated and controlled by the American Sugar Trust. There is no reason in the world except that.

Mr. EMERSON. I will say that in my town you can not get sugar except in very small amounts.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. The beet-sugar people of the West are getting 8 cents and a fraction for their sugar and we in the South are getting 8 cents and a fraction for our sugar. The Cuban crop was bought by the Food Administration under an agreed price; and I state here without fear of successful contradiction that if it had not been so bought and if the price had not been so fixed sugar would have been retailing in America for from 15 to 20 cents a pound for the last 12 months.

Mr. GOOD. Then the gentleman would advocate an embargo on sugar, would he not?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I would not.

Mr. GOOD. You would permit them to keep on sending it abroad and holding up the American consumer?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I would not. I state that there is plenty of American sugar right here in America now.

Mr. TEMPLE. How are we going to get it?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. It is here in this country. Every bit of the Cuban sugar crop was bought by us in conjunction with the royal commission of England, and that sugar was divided on a basis which gave to every man in America a sufficient supply of sugar. Remember, we are the greatest consumers of sugar on earth. The reason that sugar is scarce to-day is not because there is an actual scarcity, but because of an artificial scarcity made by the manipulation of the American Sugar Trust.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Will the gentleman from Wyoming yield me some more time?

Mr. MONDELL. I should like to yield, but the time is all promised.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I do not speak very often. I am on the committee that considered this bill, and I should like to say something more about it.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has had 10 minutes already.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes, that time not to be taken out of the hour of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I stated the question of sugar, and if any gentleman will investigate he will find that I am right. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that further exportation was forbidden three or four weeks ago, except for sugar already under contract?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I so understand it. There is no question about that. The sugar crop of the West, the sugar crop of Louisiana and of the islands comes in this fall, and while sugar will not be plentiful, there will be enough to go around.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana. I want to discuss one other question, and if I can get more time I will yield very gladly. Let us take the question of cotton. I have heard a lot of discussion in regard to the price that the man who raises the cotton is getting for his cotton. As a matter of fact the manufacturer of cotton goods, based on his prices of last Saturday, could well afford to pay a basic price of 50 cents per pound and still make better than a fair profit upon the goods that the American people are clothing themselves with. You must find out what the producer is getting for the product before you condemn the producer. To-day every buyer and every merchant who goes to the great cities to lay in his supply of goods will tell you that it is not a question of the jobber trying to sell the goods to them, but it is a question of whether or not they can get the jobber to accept their orders. The world has gone mad with buying. The world is buying everything that is offered at any price, and the manufacturer of goods and the jobber and the wholesaler has taken advantage of the situation and are wringing from the people a tremendous profit. Take the question of leather. There is no relation whatsoever between the cost of the hide and the cost of the shoe. The man who makes the shoe is able to get any price he asks, and therefore he asks a price, and the price of shoes is going up and up and up, and as long as the people will pay these prices the manufacturer of shoes will exact them. Therefore, in the final analysis it comes down to this question, that the producer on the farm, the man who raises

the farm products, must not be confused with the profiteer. I am in favor of this resolution. I am in favor of an investigation, because I believe that when the American people see the enormous difference between what the producer is getting for his product and what the consumer has to pay for the same product, that publicity itself, if nothing else, will do good. I say further than that, that this resolution ought to pass. If the Federal Trade Commission refuses to take knowledge of the fact that we have asked them for this investigation it will be easy for us to pass another resolution ordering them to do so, but I do not believe that the Federal Trade Commission will treat the House of Representatives with contempt and refuse to investigate and report.

I am sorry that I have not more time, in order that I might show how the unscrupulous are taking advantage of the situation to their benefit and to the hurt of the great mass of the people.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment? I would like to have the opportunity of making a preferential amendment.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I want to ask the consent of the gentleman from Wyoming to offer a preferential amendment to improve the text of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can do that privately with the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the high cost of living. I have some very decided views as to what factors enter into it, including profiteering.

I rose to call attention to a statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to the effect that the Federal reserve note had back of it only commercial paper. I think the gentleman is as much in error in that statement as he was in his first statement that \$13,000,000,000 of paper money had been issued during the war, which statement he subsequently corrected when his statement was challenged by me. He said he meant bank credits as well as paper money. There is something else besides commercial paper back of the Federal reserve note. I shall not correct the gentleman's statement out of any desire to engage in controversy, but because it is a fact that in some parts of the country the bankers are having trouble to get the people to take Federal reserve notes across the counter. That is because similar erroneous statements have been repeatedly made, and when it comes from a gentleman of the standing of the gentleman from Illinois it is calculated to do harm. I make the assertion, and challenge contradiction, that there is not a piece of paper money in existence in the world to-day that is better than the Federal reserve note. It has something else back of it besides commercial paper. It has the Government, the banks, and ample gold back of it. The Federal reserve note is not on a par with the greenback that depreciated after the Civil War, to which the gentleman refers.

Let us see what is back of the Federal reserve note. First of all, there are back of it the assets of the Federal reserve bank. There is back of it 100 per cent of short-time commercial paper, and there is back of it in each individual instance a minimum of 40 per cent of gold reserve, and, finally, there is back of it the pledge to redeem it in gold by the United States Treasury. The statement that we are on a paper basis is not correct. The Nation is not on a paper basis. This Nation and Spain are the two large nations of the earth that are on a gold basis at this time and have the gold with which to maintain their paper currency.

Let us take the Federal reserve note, for example. I have not seen a statement of the banks since July 1, and what I say is based on conditions July 1, 1919. There is a little over \$2,000,000,000 of Federal reserve notes outstanding, and I want to say to the House that the Federal reserve banks have in their vaults at this hour gold available for the redemption of all these notes. If you take the statements of the banks on July 1, they have 49 per cent, I think it is, reserve against their note obligation and their deposit obligation combined. In other words, the Federal reserve banks have a reserve of gold in their vaults, back of all their obligations, deposits, and everything else, amounting to 49 per cent.

Therefore the uneasiness of some people about Federal reserve notes, caused by erroneous statements like that of the gentleman from Illinois, is not justified. I would as soon have it as any piece of money on the face of the earth, and this Nation is the only great Nation on the face of the earth that is in position at this hour to redeem its pledges and redeem every piece of its paper currency if presented to-day, and redeem it in gold.

Now, I want to say there has been an inflation of credit, but there is no inflation of Federal reserve issue, and I want to

direct the attention of the House to this fact, and it is a significant fact, that every Federal reserve note to-day, theoretically, will be automatically retired within less than 15 days, because the commercial paper deposited with the Federal reserve bank as a basis for their issue has an average maturity of less than 15 days, so there can be no danger from that source. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. If those notes are canceled at the end of 15 days, if they are canceled at the end of that time, there would have to be further rediscounts for the national banks, which would cause a reissue of the notes.

Mr. WINGO. But back of the new issues will be gilt-edge commercial paper, maturing, on an average, in less than 15 days, and in addition there will be at least a 40 per cent reserve of gold. As a matter of fact, there will be practically a 100 per cent of gold back of them. And each new rediscount will represent a bona fide, not a speculative, transaction, so there will be no inflation. As a matter of fact, the Federal Reserve Board in the first six months this year reduced the volume of notes at least \$300,000,000.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker and gentleman, I do not like the rôle of appearing here as a prophet, but those of you who were in this Chamber last year may have recalled that in the discussion on the proposal to fix the price of wheat I gave a very homely illustration which showed what would happen and what has happened. I referred to an incident on the Plaza of the Capitol, where a vast concourse of people were assembled on the 4th of July to witness the war procession. When the head of the procession reached the crowd, who were all comfortably seated—if everyone had been content and mannerly they could have seen the spectacle without difficulty—a few people started to rise. Then they were followed by others who rose until the entire assemblage was on its feet, leaving their chairs to stand on the ground. In a few moments they found the last state was no better than the first, and a few proceeded to jump on the chairs. In a short while nearly everybody in that vast assemblage were standing on chairs. Now, that is what you have here precisely as the result of your first false start on the path of trying to fix the price of anything contrary to the laws of nature and nature's God. You can not do it. You made a mistake then by attempting to interfere with economic laws by saying that there shall be a minimum price, which was then far in excess of what it should have been, and the ramifications of commerce and of industry are such that everyone was bound to feel that increase. The Steel Trust were also recognized as having the right to war profits—to get more for their rails and for their steel than they were entitled to before, and so it passed along from one industry to the other. All the implements that entered into the processes of production were raised in price, and so on all along the line. There is where the mistake was made, and now we have to devolve that only which we ourselves started on its course—evolution.

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I have only a minute or so left.

Mr. BAER. The gentleman bases his argument on wheat. I want to state that the price was \$3.07 and it reduced it to \$2.20, so there has been a reduction of about 30 per cent in the price instead of a rise.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That is very true, but it does not answer my contention that we should not meddle with the economic price of wheat or any other product. If wheat went to \$3.07 a bushel, I would have let it go, and not put the sanction or the seal of the Government upon it. It was obviously a fraud; it was obviously profiteering. We should have driven at this at the start, and we should have driven also at the Steel Trust when they began their operations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, after this very interesting discussion of some 40 minutes, which has taken a wide, wide range and has been instructive and helpful, I hope the House will bear with me for a few minutes to discuss the matter now before us. The resolution offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE] went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one of the strong, capable committees of the House, and after careful consideration that committee considered that the inquiry proposed and the information sought should be confined to one class of products, a class of products which has advanced in price very greatly and in the future prices of which we are all tremendously interested as the leaves begin to fall and we begin to think about our fall and winter footwear. The committee had excellent reasons for suggesting that this inquiry and the information sought be confined to shoes rather than be extended to other articles. The gentle-

man from Missouri acquiesced in the judgment of the committee in that behalf. He, like the balance of us, is anxious to get information as soon as possible on that important subject. Now, the gentleman from Iowa has very properly said that it is very questionable whether the Federal Trade Commission would be justified in making expenditures to make further investigations of this sort under a simple House resolution. He is entirely right about that. But so long as the House resolution is confined to shoes, and the Federal Trade Commission has been investigating shoes, I think we may assume that they have information on this subject already gathered that they can give us, and whether they make further investigation or not—which I believe they would be justified in doing on their own motion—I think we may very properly request of them the information they now have and such as they can quickly obtain. The country is tremendously interested just at this time in every phase of the high cost of living, and it is the duty of the Congress, the duty of the executive departments, and of all good citizens to do everything they can toward reducing the high cost of living, but I submit that the Congress would clearly fail in its duty in the matter if it were to so broaden a resolution such as we now have before us to cover a lot of inquiries that could not be carried on by the Federal Trade Commission in the next six months, which the Federal Trade Commission would not be justified in carrying on under a House resolution, and information relative to which we could not obtain from them if the commission did take up the inquiry until long after the period when we hope that the high cost of living will be largely overcome.

I am sure gentlemen will not attempt to appeal to their constituencies through seeming to be in favor of the reduction of the high cost of living by proposing to load on the Federal Trade Commission a lot of examinations that the House acting alone has no authority to ask them to make, and which they can not make, if we did ask them in the proper way, within time to do any good. This is not the time, I submit, to demagogue in regard to this or any other matter related to the high cost of living. We have a specific matter before us. We can secure promptly, let us hope, some further information in regard to one important subject. We can later, and after proper consideration, take up other matters, but for the time our duty is to pass this resolution and get some information in regard to shoes and the facts and factors relative to their cost. And, therefore, as I see it, it is the duty of the House to adopt the committee amendments, to vote down all other amendments, and to adopt the resolution.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Does not the gentleman think if we confine this resolution solely to the matter of shoes that the public would be likely to say, "What is the matter with the cost of food and clothing, and why pick on shoes?"

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know the gentleman's constituency, but I do know mine. I assume that they realize that when I act that I am attempting to do my duty. My opinion of the constituency of the gentleman who has just spoken is that they will much more highly regard him if he sticks to the text and votes to accomplish something that can be immediately accomplished, rather than to so broaden and scatter and load down the proposed investigation that the Federal Trade Commission will never get anywhere with it within any reasonable time. You can not fool the American people. They are pretty intelligent folks, and they understand situations quite as well as we do, and nobody will be fooled because some gentlemen attempt to load down a resolution that we may reasonably hope will accomplish something helpful if passed unamended, with a lot of propositions that will complicate the situation, lead nowhere in the early ascertainment of facts, and therefore accomplish no good in the reduction of the high cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves the previous question on the resolution and amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer a preferential amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do it, of course, after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Speaker is going to put the amendments to the House, is he not?

The SPEAKER. Certainly; but the previous question has been ordered and no amendment can be offered now.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is it possible one can not offer a preferential amendment to perfect the text?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman could have done it before the previous question was ordered. The gentleman is sufficiently familiar with parliamentary law to know that the adoption of the previous question precludes the offering of an amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I think I understand the meaning of the previous question, but I do not imagine now that it prohibits me from offering an amendment to perfect the text. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Am I right that there are two amendments pending, a committee amendment and an amendment that was offered to include an inquiry as to clothing and food?

The SPEAKER. There is no amendment offered except the committee amendments.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Oh, yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of the Clerk whether any other amendment has been offered except the committee amendments. The Clerk informs the Chair that there has not been.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The gentleman from Ohio, as I understood it, offered an amendment and clearly stated his amendment. After the gentleman had concluded his remarks I rose, and the first thing I said was, "I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio"; so that my memory is clear as to the offering of the amendment by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio never offered any amendment. He said he was going to offer one.

Mr. EMERSON. I said that I moved, in line 3, after the word "shoes," to add "clothing and food products."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Notwithstanding he said that he was going to offer the amendment, he never did offer it, and the gentleman from New York was advocating a thing that had never been offered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is clear, and his opinion coincides with that of the gentleman from Missouri. The Clerk also makes the same statement.

Mr. EMERSON. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] rose and talked in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may have discussed the proposition, but never formally offered the amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. I certainly did.

Mr. GARNER. It is true that he may have made a motion, but unless the amendment was reported from the desk it is not before the House.

The SPEAKER. Of course not. The question is on the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. May I make a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. EMERSON. At what time?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman would have to be opposed to the resolution to offer the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he would recognize the gentleman. The gentleman can make the motion.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with the request that they report it back immediately with the following amendment:

After the word "shoes," in line 3, add "clothing and food products."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

Mr. GRIFFIN. One moment. And on line 4, after the word "manufacturers," insert the words "or producers."

Mr. EMERSON. I accept that.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. EMERSON offers a motion to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with instructions to that committee to report the resolution back forthwith, with the following amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "shoes," insert the words "clothing and food products," and on page 1, line 4, after the word "manufacturers," insert the words "or producers."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] to recommit the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 7, yeas 79.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, August 19, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report of the commission in response to resolution No. 71 of the House of Representatives, dated June 5, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 190); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Coast and Geodetic Survey of that department, together with an alternative estimate to provide for increase in compensation of certain employees of that bureau (H. Doc. No. 191); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the office of the Treasurer of the United States, national currency, reimbursable, this amount to be reimbursed by the National and Federal reserve banks (H. Doc. No. 192); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CURRY of California, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7417) to amend an act of Congress approved March 12, 1914, authorizing the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 231), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5976) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. O'Shea, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 8477) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rumford, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8478) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Camden, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 8479) to establish a division for the investigation of mentally handicapped children in the schools; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 8480) to dissolve and distribute the assets of the Colored Union Benevolent Association and settle its affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8481) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate a captured cannon or field gun for decorative purposes to the town of South Connellsville, Fayette County, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 8482) to imprison persons guilty of profiteering in foodstuffs and other necessities of life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 8483) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Hughesville, Pa., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 8484) granting to certain members of the military or naval service in the war with the central European powers additional pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 8485) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 8486) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish a cannon, with carriage and shells, to the city of Webb City, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY (by request): A bill (H. R. 8487) establishing rules for the interstate transportation of dead human bodies within the United States and the Territories and possessions thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8488) prescribing prohibition of burials of the human dead at sea, and providing for proper care and disposal of same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8489) amending the act of June 3, 1916, entitled "the national defense act," adding section 16½ thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 8490) amending the act of June 3, 1916, entitled "the national defense act," adding section 15½ thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 8491) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Fort Fairfield, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8492) permitting certain employees of the Government to purchase supplies from the commissary stores of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8493) to repeal sections 800, 906, and 1001, subsection 5, of the revenue act of 1918, approved February 24, 1919; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAPES (by request): A bill (H. R. 8494) to prevent profiteering in food, fuel, and wearing apparel in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITHWICK: A bill (H. R. 8495) for the relief of occupants of certain premises within the naval station at Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 8496) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, to certain widows and former widows, and certain helpless and dependent children of such soldiers and sailors, and to certain Army nurses; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 8497) to reduce night work in post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8498) authorizing a military merit badge and additional pay based thereon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8499) to authorize the Secretary of War to produce and to sell duplicate negatives and prints of motion pictures and prints, lantern slides, and enlargements of still pictures in the possession and control of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Resolution (H. Res. 244) providing for an inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission into the proposed increase in the price on men's collars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAILE: Resolution (H. Res. 245) providing for investigation and report by the Select Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, or its appropriate subcommittee, as to the general conditions, treatment, and care of soldiers who are now or who have been patients at the United States General Hospital No. 21, Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Memorial from the Legislature of Wisconsin urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing adequate compensation for soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the war against Germany, Austria, and their allies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Wisconsin, urging the Congress of the United States to work for vocational rehabilitation among our wounded and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of Wisconsin, urging the Congress of the United States to pass the bill introduced by the Hon. MARVIN JONES relating to recognition of the services of soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: Memorial from the Legislature of Wisconsin, urging the Congress of the United States to continue the work of vocational rehabilitation among our wounded and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial from the Legislature of Wisconsin, urging the Congress of the United States to continue the work of vocational rehabilitation among our wounded and disabled soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 8500) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Haycock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8501) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Hawk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8502) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Tressel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8503) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Orwig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 8504) granting an increase of pension to James King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 8505) granting an increase of pension to Herbert S. Cooley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 8506) granting a pension to Mina Bechtold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWTHER: A bill (H. R. 8507) granting a pension to Mathilda M. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 8508) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Whalen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 8509) granting a pension to Alice Harvey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 8510) granting a pension to John Beahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 8511) for the relief of the estate of Fritz Contzen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 8512) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Boyce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 8513) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Birnley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8514) granting a pension to Lillie May Fifield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 8515) granting an increase of pension to William Newell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 8516) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Pea; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 8517) granting a pension to Albert Yoder; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 8518) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 8519) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8520) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John J. Waterkeyn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OGDEN: A bill (H. R. 8521) granting a permanent disability allowance to Capt. Wallace M. Coulson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 8522) granting a pension to Amanda C. Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8523) granting an increase of pension to Baker A. Bannon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8524) granting a pension to Alice Benham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWAN: A bill (H. R. 8525) for the relief of First Lieut. Frank J. Simmons, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 8526) granting a pension to Fannie Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 8527) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay war-risk insurance to the foster parents of William Arthur Henry Dempsey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 8528) granting an increase of pension to John J. Jeffries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 8529) granting an increase of pension to Jerome A. Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 8530) granting a pension to Nancy C. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8531) granting an increase of pension to James H. Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 8532) granting a pension to Edna May Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the Council of the city of Portland, Oreg., that the other cities in the Northwest be requested to join in petitioning Congress to adopt measures to release the present store of food supplies and to make impossible the future hoarding of food by speculators; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of the Board of Trade of Newark, N. J., protesting against Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions adopted by the conference of first-class postmasters of New Jersey, with reference to increased salaries for first-class postmasters, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of 36 veterans of the Civil War, advocating legislation providing for the increase of pensions of veterans of the Civil War and increase of pensions of widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of S. K. Urquhart, of St. Louis, Mo., inclosing clipping from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat regarding the high cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Merchants' Exchange, of St. Louis, Mo., opposing S. 810, a bill to provide for the establishment of an interstate market system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rosenthal-Sloan Millinery Co., of St. Louis, Mo., opposing attempt to withdraw privilege of carrying 150 pounds of baggage with first-class passage on railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Federation of Postal Employees, St. Louis, Mo., Local No. 8, opposing House resolution 151; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of St. Louis, favoring the Townsend bill, S. 1309, which has for its purpose the creation of a Federal highway commission; to the Committee on Roads.

Also, petition of A. J. Child & Sons, St. Louis, Mo., favoring legislation to prevent profiteering; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Henry O'Neil Lumber & Land Co., St. Louis, Mo., opposing repeal of the zone advances on advertising pages of magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Schreiner Grain Co., St. Louis, Mo., inclosing letter regarding the high cost of living; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Kiwanis Club of St. Louis, urging speedy relief from profiteering; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, concerning Senate resolution 57 and House resolution 121; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Railway Mail Association, Cleveland Branch, Cleveland, Ohio, favoring a 75 per cent increase in salaries of railway mail clerks; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Charles J. Hatfield, of New York City, managing director of the National Tuberculosis Association, protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Traffic Club, of Cleveland, Ohio, opposing the Poindexter "long-and-short haul" bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of patrons of the National League Baseball Grounds, at Chicago, Ill., believing in human liberty and the principle of self-determination, urge upon the Congress of the United States to recognize the Irish Republic as now established; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of National Board of Farm Organizations, Washington, D. C., concerning antitrust laws as affecting farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of National Board of Farm Organizations, Washington, D. C., concerning antitrust laws as affecting farmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and sundry citizens of Illinois, opposing the enactment of the Kenyon bill (S. 2202), the Kendrick bill (S. 2199), and the Anderson bill (H. R. 6492), relating to the livestock and meat-packing industries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Illinois Agricultural Association and sundry citizens of Illinois, favoring repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of George A. Custer Post, No. 1, Department of Alabama, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill 7022 increasing Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Polish Alma Mater Society, opposing Senate bill 2099 to prohibit admission to the mails of publications printed in a foreign language; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Belvidere, Ill., praying for the speedy return of the Twenty-seventh and Thirty-first Infantry from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Illinois Association of Postmasters and of sundry post-office officials and employees for increased compensation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GOULD: Petition of the Weedsport (N. Y.) Branch of the Railway Mail Association, for the adoption of legislation to increase the salaries of railway mail clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of the City Council of the city of Keokuk, urging the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to make a favorable report on Senate joint resolution No. 48; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MCGLENNON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of Bayonne, urging the adoption by the Congress of the United States of a resolution providing for recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade of the city of Newark, N. J., protesting against Government ownership of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By NEELY (by request): Resolution adopted by the Logan Coal Operators' Association in re Plumb plan for nationalization of railroads; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. RAKER: Telegrams from the Madera Sugar Pine Co., Madera, Calif., and the California White & Sugar Pine Manufacturers' Association; letters from the California Sugar & White Pine Co., of San Francisco, and the Riverside Chamber of Commerce, Riverside, Calif.; telegram from the Bayside Lumber Co., of San Francisco; and letter from the California Sugar & White Pine Manufacturers' Association, of San Francisco, Calif., urging support of the Cummins bill, which provides for the return to the Interstate Commerce Commission of the power to suspend rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, telegram from the California Associated Raisin Co., Fresno, Calif., protesting against any legislation prohibiting the export of foodstuffs that would apply to raisins; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, letter from the Sisson Headlight, Sisson, Calif., protesting against any repeal of the zone postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of post office clerks of Newton, Iowa, urging an increase of salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of sundry employees of the United States Government, members of the Navy Yard Retirement Association, Navy Yard, New York, favoring Sterling-Lehlbach retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Institute for Public Service, William H. Allen, director, regarding budget plan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the Colorado Cannery Association, by P. H. Troutman, president, protesting against the Kenyon bill, Senate bill 2202; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of Mount Sugar Loaf Grange No. 111, of Dixfield, Me., protesting against the so-called Lane reclamation plan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Citizens of Wiscasset, Me., protesting against the so-called "luxury taxes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pleasant Valley Grange of Rockland, Me., protesting against the Lane reclamation plan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Hon. Walter A. Shaw, member of the public utilities commission, Springfield, Ill., urging increase in the wages of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Chicago Railway Equipment Co., by E. B. Leigh, president, Chicago, Ill., containing protest against the Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charles E. Ward, Chicago, Ill., containing protest against the Kenyon and Kendrick bills; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of George Schern, editor and manager of the Journal, Peoria, Ill., urging 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Inderrieden Canning Co., Chicago, Ill., protesting against the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Seymour & Peck Co., by C. E. Warren, president, Chicago, Ill., containing protests against the Kenyon bill and the Nolan-Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, by John M. Glenn, secretary, Chicago, Ill., containing protest against policy of board of contract adjustment in following legal precedents and Court of Claims decisions in adjusting informal contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of chamber of commerce, East St. Louis, Ill., protesting against Senate bill No. 2202; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of postmaster of Ottawa, Ill., Mr. James J. Dougherty, favoring the increase of salaries of postal employees to cope with the high cost of living; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of L. W. Meckstroth, president Woodstock Typewriter Co., Chicago, Ill., containing protest against the Nolan-Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Julius E. Weil, of Rosenwald & Weil, Chicago, Ill., urging unbiased consideration of House joint resolution 121 and Senate joint resolution 57; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of J. C. Belden, president Belden Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill., urging unbiased consideration of the House joint resolution 121 and Senate joint resolution 57, concerning conference in the interests of capital and labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Chicago Federation of Labor, 166 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill., protesting against denial of the right of asylum; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Thomas James, Springfield, Ill., urging the passage of the bill for increase in the wages of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Paul R. Lisher, Joliet, Ill., containing protest against the Kenyon and Kendrick bills; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of George A. Wood, United States yards, Chicago, Ill., containing protest against the Kenyon and Kendrick bills; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, August 19, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We invoke Thy blessing, O God our Heavenly Father, upon all the deliberations of this House to-day, that they may be in consonance with our highest conceptions of right and duty, that the onward march of civilization may be accelerated, and Thy kingdom come, and that right speedily, and Thy will be done in all the earth, under the divine leadership of the world's Great Exemplar. Amen.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.